

SYTH LIBRARY

ulation Division

Kansas State College

AYS, KANSAS

Date rec'd

Donor

Fund

be returned at the time indicated on date di-
otherwise the Librarian is required to collect a fee for use time.

16-5234

16-36-5M



WITHDRAWN



WITHDRAWN

UNIVERSITY DEBATORS'
ANNUAL

UNIVERSITY DEBATORS' ANNUAL

VOL. I-X. Out of print.

Vol. XI: 1924-1925. E. M. Phelps, editor. \$2.25.

Cabinet Form of Government.
Japanese Exclusion.
Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws.
Participation of President's Cabinet in Congress.
Birth Control.
Mencken School of Thought.
Amendment of the Volstead Act.
Child Labor.

Vol. XII: 1925-1926. E. M. Phelps, editor. \$2.25.

Revision of Rules of the United States Senate.
Government Commission for Regulation of the Coal Industry.
A Federal Department of Education.
Governmental Restriction of Individual Liberty.
Centralization of Power in the Federal Government.
Popular Referendum on War.
Air Service, a Separate Department of National Defense.
Education, the Curse of the Age.
Child Labor.

Vol. XIII: 1926-1927. E. M. Phelps, editor. \$2.25.

The McNary Haugen Farm Relief Bill.
Extraterritoriality in China.
Repeal of the Prohibition Amendment.
Military Protection for Property of the United States Citizens
on Foreign Soil.
Cancellation of Allied War Debts.
Legislative Control of Curricula in Educational Institutions.
The Governmental Principles of Mussolini.
Equal Rights Amendment.

Vol. XIV: 1927-1928. E. M. Phelps, editor. \$2.25.

Coeducation.
Direct Primary.
Armed Protection for American Investments Abroad.
United States Policy in Central America.
Power of the Press.
Too Many College Students.
Three-Fourths Jury Vote in Criminal Trials.
France and World Peace.
National Sovereignty—a Concept to Be Discarded.

Vol. XV: 1928-1929. E. M. Phelps, editor. \$2.25.

Pact of Paris.
British Criminal Procedure.
Women in Industry.
Installment Buying.
Freedom of Speech.
Insanity as a Defense in Crime.
Jury System.
National Advertising.
Government Ownership and Operation of Power Sites.

Vol. XVI: 1929-1930. E. M. Phelps, ed. \$2.25.

Foreign Debts and the Tariff.
Chain Store System.
Arbitration of International Disputes.
International Disarmament.
Ontario System of Liquor Control.
Censorship
Higher Education for Exceptional Students Only.
Cotsworth Thirteen-Month Calendar.
Oriental versus Western Civilization.

UNIVERSITY DEBATORS' ANNUAL

Constructive and Rebuttal Speeches Delivered in Debates
of American Colleges and Universities during
the College Year, 1929-1930

Edited by
EDITH M. PHELPS



NEW YORK
THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY
1930

808.5

U58nd

v. 16, 1929-1930, c. 2

Published September 1930

Printed in the United States of America

23878

PREFACE

Nine intercollegiate debates are included in this volume, each accompanied by briefs and a selected bibliography. They are representative of the season's debating for 1929-1930, and cover subjects which it is hoped will prove suitable for future debating also. The stenographic reports are printed as they were taken, edited for obvious errors only.

Foreign universities, Oxford and New Zealand, were represented in two of these debates. Another was covered on one side by representatives of the Chinese Debating Council of Harvard University, two Chinese students returning to their own land. The Bates University debate was held on its own home platform, between the winning teams who secured for Bates the championship for 1929-1930 of the Eastern Intercollegiate Debating League. Pittsburgh University furnished one of the debates given under the auspices of its Debating Association as an extension service to local clubs, lodges, and schools. This debate was broadcasted.

Decision was given by audience shift of opinion in three cases, and in two others a critic judge spoke to the audience at the close of the debate, analyzing and comparing the work of the two teams, and stating which, in his opinion, made the better case. In two debates, a discussion from the floor followed the debate.

The most novel form of debate offered in this series was the symposium held between the two representatives of the Chinese Debating Council and members of a team from Western Reserve University. This was one of Western Reserve's "extension" debates, given before a Cleveland lodge. The four debaters were allowed to develop individual ideas and disagree with their colleagues, or agree with their opponents or not as they wished. The decision was given by an audience shift of opinion vote on the merits of the question.

Except as otherwise mentioned, the bibliographies accompanying these debates have been prepared by Ruth Virtue Tichenor, and the briefs by the compiler. Grateful acknowledgment is made to all who assisted so generously in securing the necessary stenographic reports and other material for publication.

EDITH M. PHELPS

August 6, 1930

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

FOREIGN DEBTS AND THE TARIFF

	PAGE
Introduction	11
Brief	12
Oxford University Affirmative and University of Missouri Negative Speeches	17
Bibliography	43

CHAPTER II

THE CHAIN STORE SYSTEM

Introduction	61
Brief	62
Northwestern University Affirmative and University of Iowa Negative Speeches	67
Bibliography	116

CHAPTER III

ARBITRATION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

Introduction	131
Brief	132
Columbia University Affirmative and Victoria College Nega- tive Speeches	141
Bibliography	170

CHAPTER IV

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT

	PAGE
Introduction	183
Brief	184
University of Southern California Affirmative and Colorado State Teachers College Negative Speeches	191
Bibliography	212

CHAPTER V

ONTARIO SYSTEM OF LIQUOR CONTROL

Introduction	227
Brief	228
University of Wisconsin Affirmative and Ohio State Uni- versity Negative Speeches	237
Bibliography	276

CHAPTER VI

CENSORSHIP

Introduction	287
Brief	288
Bates College Affirmative and Negative Speeches	295
Bibliography	318

CHAPTER VII

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL
STUDENTS ONLY

Introduction	327
Brief	328
Swarthmore College Affirmative and New York University Negative Speeches.....	335
Bibliography	364

CHAPTER VIII

THE COTSWORTH THIRTEEN MONTH
CALENDAR

	PAGE
Introduction	379
Brief	380
University of Pittsburgh Affirmative and Negative Speeches	383
Bibliography	408

CHAPTER IX

ORIENTAL VERSUS WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Introduction	417
Brief	418
Chinese Debating Council of Harvard University and Western Reserve University Speeches	425
Bibliography	460
INDEX	469

CHAPTER I

FOREIGN DEBTS AND THE TARIFF

OXFORD UNIVERSITY

versus

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

RESOLVED: *That the United States cannot expect to have her debts paid until her tariff barriers are substantially reduced.*

The following debate was held on December 5, 1929 between representatives of Oxford University and the University of Missouri, in Columbia, Mo. An audience shift of opinion ballot was used in determining the decision, which was ninety-six for Oxford and ninety-two for Missouri.

This report of the debate was secured for the Annual thru the kindly services of Professor Robert F. Young, Acting Director, Forensic Activities for the University of Missouri. He said of the debate

"It was one of the most interesting and instructive of the international debates held on the University campus in recent years. It was, of course, punctuated with a lively exchange of wit and clever sallies. But in the main, the speakers hewed close to the line of sincere argument. The desire for the stimulation of public information and discussion dominated the debate. The fact that the subject was a lively topic of campus discussion for several days afterward, attested to the measure of success in this direction."

BRIEF

FOREIGN DEBTS AND THE TARIFF

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION

- A. Before the War America was a debtor nation.
 - 1. She owed large sums of money all over the world, particularly to England and the European countries.
 - a. For money loaned her to develop her virgin territories.
 - 2. She was able to pay interest on her debts without difficulty, by exporting her goods.
 - a. England was the greatest of her creditors.
 - (1) England, as a free trade country, gave America the greatest market for her products.
- B. Europe is now the debtor.
 - 1. Europe is indebted to America for assistance rendered during the World War.
- C. The question is how can Europe make payment on her debts to America.
- I. The debt can only be paid by the importation of European goods into America.
 - A. That has become a very difficult problem.
 - 1. Since the War America has imposed a very high tariff rate on imported goods.
 - a. This increases the cost of goods and makes it more difficult to import them.
 - B. The balance of trade in America's favor at present is about \$900,000,000.
 - 1. What has saved the world from bankruptcy so far is that America has loaned back to the rest of the world sums equal to this debt.
 - a. The day will come when she will no longer do it.

- C. Other suggested means of financing the debt are not practicable.
 - 1. The American tourist trade cannot be increased to cover it.
 - 2. American charity should not be stimulated to the amount of \$900,000,000 if it could be.
 - 3. The amount of goods given to foreign shipping to carry can only be increased by making trade between the old and the new world more free.
 - D. The only alternative is to import more of European goods.
 - 1. This can only be done by decreasing the tariff.
 - a. America will not be willing to cancel the debts altogether.
 - b. They cannot be paid in gold.
 - (1) There is not enough gold in the world to do it, and America has over one-third of it already.
- II. The tariff should be reduced as a matter of morality.
- A. What was bought from America was not gold but goods.
 - 1. The debt must be paid in goods.
 - a. Since Europe does not produce gold, the only alternative is bankruptcy.
 - B. Tariff walls are meant to keep out foreign goods.
 - 1. To benefit manufacturers and laborers at home.
 - C. A tariff on European goods is, in addition to requiring payment of the debt and the interest agreed upon, a further impost of one-third upon the whole.
 - 1. If payment is offered as agreed upon, America cannot in common justice require a further payment of one-third before accepting it.

NEGATIVE

- I. The European debt can be paid without interfering with the tariff.
 - A. Debts between individuals or loans between two countries should be excluded from this discussion.
 - 1. There is not much danger that they will not be paid.

- B. The debts incurred during or following the World War, which are the debts in question, can be paid.
1. Payments have been arranged for by economic exports.
 - a. The payments are planned to increase as the years go by.
 - (1) The experts who planned them figured that the nations would grow wealthier and be more able to pay as time went on.
 2. Each nation must create sufficient wealth above its own needs in order to get the money.
 - a. It can be raised by
 - (1) Taxation.
 - (2) Receipts from the tourist trade.
 - (3) Remittances sent home by immigrants in this country.
 - b. These channels are all outside of trade.
 3. It can be transferred in American dollars.
 - a. American dollars are taken to Europe and exchanged for European money in great quantities by tourists.
 - (1) In 1927 alone, \$800,000,000 was spent in Europe by Americans traveling abroad.
 - b. Immigrants in this country sent \$225,000,000 to their families and friends in Europe.
 - c. American dollars are paid to British shipping interests for shipping American goods.
 - d. One and one-half million Americans live abroad who have the source of their income in the United States but spend it in Europe.
 - e. All this money eventually finds its way into European banks and can be utilized by foreign governments in paying debts.
- C. To say that the tariff acts as a restrictive embargo and keeps foreign goods out of this country is a misstatement.
1. Of the four and one-half billion dollars worth of goods that come into this country every year, three billion dollars worth are on the free list.
 - a. Over 65 per cent of our tariffs are free.

- D. Another source of financial help is the use of American capital all over the world.
 - 1. It goes into the railroads, factories and other institutions, thus helping industry and creating more wealth.
- E. The statement that Europe owes America the additional sum of \$900,000,000 each year is somewhat exaggerated.
 - 1. A large part of it represents American investments abroad.
 - a. Investments by Henry Ford in his European factories.
 - b. By the General Motors, the Standard Oil Company, the United Fruit Company and other organizations, interested in the development of new markets and industries.
 - c. Investors do not want repayment of these investments—only the interest on them.
 - 2. The balance due can be collected.
 - a. Loans will be refused if creditors find there is little probability of their being repaid.
 - (1) With less money and less credit Europe will reduce purchases of American goods and so reduce its debts.
 - (2) With the eventual disappearance of the American export surplus, and attendant increase in the availability of the American dollar, debtor nations will be able to pay us in our own dollars.
 - b. The elimination of debts will be but a matter of time.
 - (1) England and other debtor nations are now meeting their annual debt payments in precisely this way.
 - (2) They have met the agreed payments as due, thereby demonstrating both their ability and their willingness to pay.

FOREIGN DEBTS AND THE TARIFF

OXFORD UNIVERSITY

versus

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

CHAIRMAN

Dean Tisdell

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We are very fortunate indeed to be able to open our College of Arts and Science Week with such an interesting and significant occasion as this debate between the University of Missouri and Oxford University. I shall have occasion during the program to say a little about Arts and Science Week but not now.

Will you please refer to the so-called ballot which you have in your hand. It is the request that you shall, before the debate begins, *check one of the spaces on the left of the ballot.*

I believe in the Affirmative of the resolution to be debated,
or

I am undecided, or

I believe in the Negative of the resolution to be debated.

After the debate, will you then score your opinion *on the right side of the ballot.*

I believe more strongly in the Affirmative of the resolution than I did before, or

I believe in the Affirmative of the resolution.

For example, after one has scored, I believe in the Affirmative of the resolution to be debated, and then has been confirmed in his opinion, he will write,

I believe more strongly in the Affirmative of the resolution than I did before, or

I believe in the Affirmative of the resolution, or

If he was undecided, I am now undecided, or

I believe in the Negative of the resolution, or

If I had voted in the Negative, I believe more strongly in the Negative than I did.

The subject for debate you will find stated upon the program.

I now have the pleasure of introducing to you Mr. Bernard J. M. MacKenna, who will speak first for the Affirmative of the resolution.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Bernard J. M. MacKenna, Oxford

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is my first duty to express, on behalf of my two colleagues and myself, our gratitude for the splendid reception you have given us this evening. Nothing could have been kinder than America in its hospitality and it is, of course, a delightful thing for us to find ourselves at last in Columbia. We have overcome those difficulties which confront every visitor to America's hospitable shores. Though America's hospitality has become proverbial, yet it is no such easy thing for strangers, like my two friends and myself, to penetrate within the sphere of its welcome. Before we were allowed to enter this country, we had, first, to satisfy your government by answering a long series of questions of our high moral character and of our political opinions. The first of these questions was, were we in favor of *polygamy*. That was not all; the second question was, were we in favor of *anarchy*. After discussing, however, the loose habits of the princes together with the forms of established government we were asked had we brought with us at least \$50, as if any one could practice the institutions of polygamy on less than \$50. All these questions we have answered satisfactorily; we had the \$50, so far, we have addressed our minds to the subject that we are not in favor of anarchy and we are supporters of both the Republican and Democratic parties. In a word we have established our respectability.

Very frequently we find our little expedition like to that recently made by Mr. MacDonald and yet it is my duty, at the outset, to make perfectly plain in all respects our main differences. Mr. MacDonald came into your country in a spirit of peace; we have come here with the intention of disagreeing with every American University on every subject except polygamy and anarchy, which they care to propose; and this is one

of the most difficult of these subjects. It is a subject which deals with the impoverishment of Europe and must be a difficult one to argue before an American audience.

You are enjoying an unparalleled prosperity. We are under the impression that America is approaching the golden age; you already have the gold and the age will come with time. However difficult this may be, we must face the task; it is doubly difficult because it deals with economic problems of great complexity.

I am reminded of a story I heard while traveling thru Iowa. One farmer addressed his neighbor across the partition dividing their farms:

"I hear you do not approve of the Monroe Doctrine."

"What's that? I do not approve of the Monroe Doctrine? Why I am prepared to lay down my life for it; I have a wife and two children and they would lay down their lives for the Monroe Doctrine."

"But do you know what the Monroe Doctrine is?" "No, but I'm prepared to lay down my life to defend it."

Many may not realize what the issue before the house is, so that is my task. Before the War, America was a debtor and she owed considerable sums over all the world, particularly to England and other European countries for the money they had lent her to develop her virgin territories. America had no difficulty in paying interest on her debts; she paid it in exporting her goods. We say paid it in goods and received annual payments on her goods. We had become the greatest of your creditor nations. England is a great free trade country and afforded America the greatest market in the world for her products. You are no longer a debtor nation; Europe has become the debtor Nation. Europe has become indebted to you because of the assistance you rendered in the great War in establishing our industries after years of turmoil and confusion. The question is, "How are we to make payments on our debts to America." I am sure it can only be done through importation of European goods into the American market. That has become a difficult problem.

Since the great War you have imposed on foreign goods a very high tariff rate. I have forgotten the exact percentage, but I think it is something like 35 per cent. This imposition of 35 per cent is a very high rate, indeed. It has become very difficult to import our goods into America. To make or impose a high

tariff is to make those goods more expensive and that is the prime object in mind of the American legislators by making it a difficult thing for us to import our goods into America. Now the difficulty is shown in the figures which support the balance of trade in America and the rest of the world.

I shall explain briefly what the matter of the balance of trade between the two countries at the present moment is. On one side you have the world's indebtedness to America—first, for American goods because we are extensive customers. We have to pay interest annually on these debts, then we have to pay interest on the debts which I have just explained, then you have America's indebtedness to the world. Here is America's debt for tourists and for those remittances which she sends back to relatives in the old world, and lastly, for machinery services and for shipping service which she pays primarily to England for the service of carrying American goods. That is in detail the balance of trade between America and the rest of the world. America was the gainer by \$900,000,000; that is to say, America's indebtedness to the rest of the world for the world's goods and services was \$900,000,000 less than what the world owed America on account of American goods and American debts. Why doesn't the world go bankrupt? Well, what has saved us has been the fact that America has loaned back to the rest of the world sums equal to this \$900,000,000. The world's indebtedness annually increases by \$900,000,000. The time will come when America will cease to finance this debt, that day is bound to come pretty soon and the only way to avoid bankruptcy of European nations is to afford us some other way than borrowing more of America's money to cover this annual deficit.

There are two or three different ways: you could increase your number of tourists who come to Europe annually. Great numbers of American tourists come, Westminster Abbey is annually playing to full capacity house and the Tower of London has more Americans in it than any crowded American penitentiary. But I do not think the number of American tourists can be increased enough to cover this deficit of \$900,000,000. You can, of course, increase the amount of money contributed to European charity. That would be very good work, indeed. I do not think, however, it is practicable to stimulate American charity to the point of \$900,000,000. You could, of course,

increase the amount of goods which you employ our ships to transport; that could only be done by making trade between the new world and the old world freer. By making too high tariffs, you are making it difficult; the only alternative left is to make it possible for us to import more of our goods into America; that you can only do by reducing your tariff. Your tariff duty makes our goods dearer and our only chance will be greatly increased by your purchasing European goods. By allowing this deficit to run from year to year, things will in time right themselves.

Unless you are willing to accept what we are offering you this evening you will either have to cancel the debts altogether, and I don't think many Americans will be willing to do that, or to lessen the amount of goods which Europe buys from America and no American manufacturer will do that either, or reduce the tariff, or your debt will not be paid.

Thank you.

DEAN TISDEL—It is our pleasure to introduce Mr. Donald C. Cox, representing the University of Missouri, who will speak fifteen minutes on the negative side of this proposition.

FIRST NEGATIVE

Donald C. Cox, Missouri

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am sure that, speaking on behalf of the University of Missouri, on behalf of the Missouri Debating Team, Arts and Science Week, and anyone represented, we surely take a lot of pleasure in welcoming the boys from Oxford tonight. These debates give us a broader vision and point of view and make us see the world is not such a large place after all. It reminds me of a story of an American tourist, who was traveling over in parts of England. As it happened he became a bit intoxicated. He was having considerable trouble hitting the table with his hat. An English bobby came along and inquired after the health of the intoxicated man. He managed to get to his feet and between hiccoughs he said,

"Hello, Sarg, where you from?"

The bobby was a bit taken back but with politeness he said, "From Bristol. Are you from Bristol?"

"Oh, no, no, I'm from Topeka, Kansas." But the world is a small place after all.

We have come together tonight for a more or less formal session on questions in which we ought all to be interested. Now the question, as defined by our chairman tonight, was this: *That the United States cannot expect to have her debts paid until her tariff barriers are substantially reduced.*

The question, in the first place, is too broad. It involves two of the greatest economic problems facing the world today, debt payment and tariff bugaboo. The question is terribly illogical for this reason. By the rules for debate, the Affirmative is supposed to answer *yes* and the Negative *no*. Our friends from Oxford would be obliged to come before you and say: *Yes*, you cannot expect your debts to be paid, while we, the Negative, would come before you and say: *No*, we cannot expect the debts to be paid. When I took Freshman English, I was taught two negatives made an affirmative. It is hard to tell who stands for what on this debate. If we try logically to analyze the questions, we are not sure. Like the old dorky, who was caught stealing chickens we are going nowhere fast.

Our stand tonight will be: we believe these debts can be paid without interfering with the tariff as it is today. Now I believe in fairness to you folks here tonight, certain terms must be defined. What do we mean by debts? Do we mean the debts of the Frenchmen, the Englishmen, or the Americans; or, do we mean the debt of the Siamese government to certain individuals and certain corporations in the United States; or debts of the British government; or Italian government; or French government; or which kind of debts do we mean to include? Our contention is this: There are certain debts that there is not much doubt as to whether they will be paid—debts between individuals or those brought about by loans between two countries. Many are secured loans of a private nature, are being paid, and are not at all affected by the tariff. As if each one of you had a one hundred dollar bond and each time you took your scissors out of your drawer and cut off a coupon, you are being paid. There is not much danger that the debt will not be paid. This sort of debt should be excluded from the debate tonight.

We are concerned mostly with the debts incurred during and after the World War. We are not at all sure these debts should be paid. It will be a real hardship for the European nations to pay these. I wish all the debts would be canceled. Here

are the debts and here is the tariff. Can these debts be paid without lowering the tariff? It is our contention that they can. Let us go back into history and see how they were contracted. During the World War, when the European nations were throwing every bit of their power to the front, they could not fight and raise their food, so they had to get it somewhere else. What did our government do? It floated a series of Liberty Bonds, which it sold to the people of the United States, and with the money raised in this way, furnished food and ammunition needed, and sent them to the countries who needed them, taking in return the I. O. U.'s of the various nations and promises to pay.

This went on for several years until the war was over, and Uncle Sam got around to balancing the books, and found he was in the red. European nations were ready to let the matter slide. We had a debt of seven million dollars, which we had to pay to the people who had bought Liberty Bonds. Nations were invited to come over and settle their accounts which they did. In the agreements of 1927, all the nations agreed to pay us over a period of sixty-two years. This was worked out by financial experts of the world. These payments over the sixty-two-year period get larger and larger as the years go by, indicating that these economic experts thought that the nations of Europe would be getting more and more wealthy and would be more able to pay as time went on. And so this is the way the debts were contracted. The average total payment they expected each to make was \$346,000,000, a small figure as international finances go. \$346,000,000? It sounds like a terrific sum but do not be misled by it. I was talking to a man who said, "Why, that's no amount of money. You ought to try to buy a shirt over there." Each American tourist feels he, himself, is paying half of the allied debt. He is not far wrong.

Now getting back, we have this obligation that has to be met each year. How are they going to do it? How are international debts to be paid? There are two steps: First, a nation must create sufficient wealth above its own needs in order to get the money; second, it must transfer that money to the debtor nation. When it has done these things, the debt is said to be paid.

How is Europe to raise the money? Now there are various and divers ways: First and foremost by taxation. We under-

stand that Europe is taxed to a great extent at the present time. It is a situation inevitable through all time. There are always some nations that have to pay and the way they have paid in the past is by taxation. But that is not the only means.

Mr. MacKenna spoke of the tourist trade. Do you realize how much that amounts to each year? Very nearly a billion dollars and the man who bought the shirt told me the profit on goods they sold American tourists was about 65 per cent clear profit. By rapid calculation, we have some \$650,000,000 available from tourist trade.

Then, too, we have immigrant remittances. Immigrants are constantly pouring over here to the land of milk and honey, incense and myrrh. They send \$225,000,000 in currency and gold back to the old country every year. These channels are thoroughly outside of international trade. Trade does not enter at all. The total sum of all these is three times the total sum owed the United States government. My colleagues will tell you of other ways they can raise money in trade over the tariff barrier plus this sum which is three times what they owe us. They can raise this sum in their own currency and they can transfer it. The debt can be paid and any man can expect the debt will be paid.

DEAN TISDEL—The next speaker on the Affirmative is Mr. Richard T. D. Acland, representing Oxford University, who will speak ten minutes.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Richard T. D. Acland, Oxford

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is first my pleasant duty to express on behalf of my two colleagues and myself our very sincere appreciation of your kindness to us in Columbia. Indeed, throughout our tour, we have been accorded the most generous welcome. We have had an opportunity too of studying your amazingly confident prosperity, and of endeavoring to find an answer to the question which must interest and perplex all visitors to your country, the question on what your prosperity is founded, and from what causes it springs. Some are tempted to attribute it to the war. I must disagree with all such; in my

view, though the war made all other countries poorer, it did not enrich the United States. Some look to the vastness of the area and the resources of your country, but I do not think the answer is to be found there. Others again attribute your prosperity to the use you make of advertising, and certainly your advertisements are more effective than any others in the world,—you must have heard of the man who gargled listerine for three months and then found he was unpopular anyway. But in my opinion the prosperity of America rests on the character of the American people. It is certainly true that when the lids of ginger beer bottles are being produced at the cost of one-tenth of a cent, the American takes the same pleasure in producing a hundred thousand for nine dollars fifty as the Englishman could only find in landing a fifteen pound salmon, or knocking down a high-flying pheasant. And as long as that continues to be so, I rather imagine that you will be able to produce most things in rather greater numbers and at rather lower prices than we can across the water.

Now turning to this question under review, we find that it is one of the greatest complication, capable of being confused and obscured by a mass of detail which is inessential, and which I imagine we shall hear of from the other side of the house before the end of the evening. My opponents will talk about triangular trade, they will talk about the trade in essential commodities, they will talk about the inter-relations of the various European nations, and will tell you about the money-raising powers of France and Germany and England—meaning, of course, the powers those nations have of raising francs, marks and pounds. All these considerations are outside the range of our discussion tonight.

There are only two parties involved in this question, you and the rest of the world. And the relation between those two parties is that the world is deeply indebted to you. I am sorry that we are unable to meet our opponents in their desire to limit the question solely to war debts, or governmental debts. After all we framed this question, and sent it to you as one of five which we were prepared to discuss. If we had intended to discuss war debts only we would have altered the wording of the question to read: That America cannot expect to have her war debts paid until her tariffs are substantially reduced. My opponents, by way of comparison, have mentioned the previous state

of indebtedness of America to England. Almost the whole of that indebtedness was made up of private debts; and I fear that even if we set out to consider nothing but war debts, we will find that the question of private debts is one which must creep in.

Now what is your situation? The world owes you money. How are we to pay? I put it to you as something fundamental to our whole case that we can only pay you what we owe if we are able to send you goods, and to render you services which are of greater value than the goods and the services which you send and render to us. It is of no value to take one or two items from international trade and say this is enough, or that is enough, to pay the debt. You must review the whole total of international trade relations. And for that purpose I have brought with me a pamphlet entitled, *The Balance of International Payments for the United States 1929*, published by your Department of Commerce.

From that I quote, in round figures, that America must be paid by the world:

For goods	Five billion dollars
Interest on private lending	Three-quarters of a billion
Interest on public lending	One-quarter of a billion
Total	Six billion dollars

As against that you have to pay:

For goods	Four billions
For tourist services	Half a billion
For immigrant remittances	Quarter of a billion
For interest on investments	Quarter of a billion
For the balance of services, insurance, freight, etc.	One-tenth of a billion
Total	Five and one-tenth billion dollars.

To sum the matter up, you have to pay, each year, five and one-tenth billion dollars, and you have to be paid six billions, and the question arises—how is the balance of nine hundred million dollars paid to you? The answer is that it isn't paid. You relend it year by year to the rest of the world.

You may say that this individual or that individual is repaying his debt. You may say that this nation or that nation can repay its debt. But can you say that the world is repaying its debt to you, when every year you are relending a greater sum than the sum which is paid back?

I suggest that the present condition of your international balance of trade must be altered before you can say that the debts of the world, taken as a whole, are being repaid. How can it be changed? I suggest that it would be changed if the tariff barriers were reduced. My opponents may question that. I will give no figures. I will ask them merely, what those tariff barriers are? Are they there merely in order to give Senators something to talk about? Of course not. They are there to keep out foreign goods, and if they were removed, the foreign goods would come in. That would change the international balance of payments, and make it possible for the world to pay her debts to you.

My opponents, in order to win their case, must prove that there is some other way in which the international balance of payments may be altered. They may suggest that we pay in gold. The short answer to that is that there is not enough gold in the world to pay the debts we owe you, and in any case you have over one-third of it already.

You must not treat us as beggars come here to ask of you a concession. We are perfectly happy, and it is entirely for you to decide what you will do. All we say is, that if you keep out our goods you cannot expect us to pay our debts. We have but one coin in our pockets. At present you seem unwilling to accept it. Some day you may see fit to change your mind, but till that happy day, you know darn well, if I may say so, that we can't give you anything but love.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Charles E. Prettyman, Missouri

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The question for debate this evening as has previously been stated to you by our chairman is: *Resolved that the United States cannot expect to have her debts paid until her tariff barriers are substantially reduced.*

My colleague, Mr. Cox, has dealt with the justification of the negative side this evening. He has defined a good many terms which we will continue to use throughout the debate. He has laid the foundation. It shall be my purpose to point out to you that foreign nations can pay their debts without resorting to an extreme policy of reduction in the tariff. The ways in which

the debt can be paid, as the gentlemen of the opposition have said to you, how can we Americans be so inconsistent as to believe that foreign nations can pay their debts when we have closed our doors to goods coming in from abroad by the so-called tariff walls, and say to these foreigners that we do not want to trade with you but keep our money in our own pockets. Since we have that attitude, the foreigner in reality receives no money with which to pay his debts. With a casual or superficial observation the stand might seem to be correct but with a closer analysis the question of debt payment becomes apparent. How can debtor nations raise money in their own country to pay the debt? After they have raised this money, how can they transfer it into American dollars, because the debt must be paid in dollars. My colleague has dealt with the former, I shall deal with the latter.

As he says, the important question is how can the debtor nations get their money transferred into these American dollars? After all this is a simple case. For a concrete example, let us take a rather unusual name, Mr. John Smith. The Negative will picture Mr. Smith as a big butter and egg man who is well-off financially, and decides it would be quite nice for himself and family to take a year off and tour Europe. He goes to his banker and gets travelers checks or express checks. We can picture their voyage enroute to Europe. Perhaps they have gone on an English ship. I think my friends from Oxford will agree, Mr. Smith's American dollars will at once start being spent on reaching European soil. His American dollar will be continuously exchanged for pounds; when in France, dollars for francs; and in Italy, dollars for lire. Now we have all this money which has gone into the pockets of Europe and which eventually finds its way into the banks of these foreign countries. Take, for example, the French government with money it has taken—the American dollar is in the possession of the French government. Debt payment must be made in dollars. All the government has to do is send these dollars to the American government, where they are placed in the Treasury and the debt is thus completed.

I should like to make a few remarks in regard to tourist trade. Tourist trade in reality represents a tremendous sum of money. In France alone 75,000 Americans were accounted for in two short months. France may have more American tour-

ists than any other nation of Europe, receiving larger sums from trade with American traffic. In the year, 1927, \$800,000,000 was spent by tourists from the United States traveling abroad. Do not let my worthy friends from Oxford minimize the trade. It is large enough to meet the interest and principal on the debt for every one of the sixty-two years of payment of each of the foreign nations which owes us money. Tourist trade alone can solve the problem of this debate tonight.

In this connection, there is another sum of money which finds its way into the pockets of Europe. Tonight we have had the United States pictured as the melting pot of nations; the United States as a young nation; in brief, the land of milk and honey. Many people of Europe have left their homes and business and have come to the United States. Yearly they send to friends and relatives abroad large sums of money. In 1927, they sent \$225,000,000, a direct payment in dollars, representative of a direct claim upon the American people.

Another item in regard to debt settlements, particularly with Great Britain, is the fact that American shippers pay heavily for the service rendered by British ships. At the same time, the American dollar is being spent for this shipping. It constitutes another means of payment. Another issue of interest is the fact that one and one-half million Americans live abroad and have their source of income in the United States but spend their money in European commodities. The Affirmative would lead you into the belief that our tariff is an absolute restrictive embargo and keeps foreign goods out of our country. With closer scrutiny we find this is a broad misconception. As a matter of fact, four and one-half billion dollars worth of goods come into the United States every year. Three billion dollars worth come in on the free import list and one and one-half billion dollars worth come in over the tariff. Besides this, over 65 per cent of our tariffs are free. Therefore, with over half of our imports duty free, coming in over the tariff, should there be another reduction of the tariff? This is a statement made by Secretary Mellon and backed up by the Department of Commerce. Why should there be a further reduction in our tariff?

Now, another source of help, financially, is the fact that American capital has found its way around the world. Our money has gone into their roads, their railroads, their factories

and other institutions, causing the wheels of industry to spin faster and more people are called into employment; thus, another claim of dollars. With respect to this class, conditions have been bettered because of America. Mr. Reeves will give you further enlightenment. I hope I have proved to you that the foreign nations can pay their debts because of tourist trade, immigrant remittances, service to shippers, Americans living abroad, the fact that one and one-half billion dollars worth of goods comes in over the tariff, and because of American investments in foreign countries.

Now, it is my conclusion that, since money can be paid through these channels, there is no need for further reduction in our tariffs.

DEAN TISDEL—It has been said that Americans always exaggerate. I think the American is rather modest in the number of initials he has. I am now introducing Mr. William J. K. Diplock.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

William J. K. Diplock, Oxford

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I have been given such a delightful time here that I am going to do something that I have not done on this tour before. I am going to be perfectly frank. I came to this country stuffed full of prejudices. In England we call them traditions. I had believed that the biggest mistake ever made in the history of the world was made by Columbus when he discovered America, and I had also believed the second biggest mistake was made by Columbus when he showed he could not keep it a secret. Perhaps worst of all I had read Sinclair Lewis. Now, after six weeks in this country, I have lost those prejudices. This trip has been an education in itself. Mr. Acland has found it a coeducation in itself.

There have been explained to me at various times the three great watchwords of your country: liberty, equality and fraternity—and the greatest of these is sorority. Equality—well, you have that. Everywhere we have been treated by everyone as brothers, except by Bostonians who treated us as ancestors. Fraternity—well, that is the pillar of your system. Your educational system exists to make the younger generation better citi-

zens than their fathers. The faculty is here to impress that on their brains—the fraternities, as far as I can judge from the paddles, approach the matter from the other end. Still the object is the same. There remains liberty—well, in a prohibition country why bring that up! But there is one bit of advice that I got from Americans in London that I have stuck to through thick and thin: “Do not criticize or contradict your hosts. They won’t like it.” That puts me in an awkward position this evening. It includes both. A debating team from Oxford will be a diplomatic failure. As you see, I want to regard it not as a match of the union but as an earnest expression of my gratitude for the unfailing courtesy we have been accorded. Apart from this I feel there is another thing which makes me think I shall not prove a popular figure tonight. I must tell you that I am proposing to deal with the moral side of this question. My friends, speaking as invincible exponents themselves, could be impersonal when they pointed out the inevitable economic necessity of a reduction in the tariff. If they have succeeded my task is easy. Like all popular moralists I only have to make a virtue out of it. No moralist has ever succeeded in making moral necessity a virtue. My colleagues have told you you must reduce your tariffs; I shall show why you should. It is now about ten years too late to discuss the general ethics of war debts. It might have been done in 1919. There is no nation that can let us admit that Europe owes you the money. Europe is willing to pay. There remains one further question: Is America willing to receive? As a member of a country that is paying seventy-five million dollars annually, I should be at a loss to estimate your reluctance to receive. As a member of a country that has been making strenuous efforts that the sins of the fathers shall be visited on the third and not the fourth generation, I should be the first to admit your willingness to accept. What you are demanding from Europe is gold. In 1923 we sent over a goose to negotiate with you and you were led to the conclusion that it laid golden eggs. Your zoology was at fault. Our factories produce not gold but goods; our mines not gold but iron and coal; our fields not gold but food. It is not that we will not pay you in gold; it is that we cannot. If we had incurred those debts in gold, then you could be repaid in that gold which you lent us. It was no good to us in the Great War. I remember, as a small boy, standing in long lines before shops, waiting for

them to open, each with ration tickets in his hands. It was not gold we asked for but American wheat, bread, sugar, jam and meat. And I remember, too, standing down by the stations watching the supply trains go out to the front. It was not American gold they held but American guns, American shells, food, American supplies. It was not gold we had from you. It was goods, the fruit of your fields, your toil, products of your factories and your brains. I am not suggesting that what was paid in goods has been wiped out in blood. You worked for us in 1914; we too are willing to work for you now. What was bought in goods should be repaid in goods. And what common morality suggests, economics dictates. Every golden dollar Europe pays you she must, in the long run, pay in goods. The fact that she does not produce gold makes that inevitable. The choice is either that or bankruptcy. Is America so willing to receive? Ask the commercial magnates and lobbyists who work for tariff; ask the esteemed laborers if their trade is sheltered by tariff walls.

What are the tariff walls for? To keep out European goods. And what are European goods? Simply the only method Europe has of repaying. My colleagues were pleading for common sense; I am pleading for common morality. If I owed any one of you a debt and if, when the time came to pay, I brought you something agreed upon, could you in common justice ask me further to pay the impost of one-third before you would accept it? Yet, what I feel sure you would not do as private citizens, you would do as citizens of the United States. A tariff on import goods is, in addition to our debt and to the interest agreed upon, a further impost of one-third of the whole.

Now if I were speaking as an Englishman tonight, I could not say that you have treated us as blood cousins; but I claim to be speaking as an American, not so much perhaps a present day politician but as a mouthpiece of the fathers of your country. On May 29, 1792, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, after full deliberation and discussion, signed their names to a document for pretended debts to their mother country which they had created. Let me read their sentences: "To the necessity for some delay in the repayment of debts may be added the British embargoes, which hinder us by excluding valuable branches of our home products and by profiteering from debtors at the moment of purchase. If these

means are taken away by the creditor himself, he ought not to complain of the debt which is not in effect of his own accord."

When the time comes to take the votes this evening, there are three more which should be added to the affirmative: George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and Thomas Jefferson, who one hundred thirty-seven years ago cast their votes on this side of the motion.

THIRD NEGATIVE

Albert L. Reeves, Missouri

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is not necessary for me to tell you how completely your sympathy has been aroused by the magnificent address which you have just heard. It is needless to say that the appeal made by the gentleman from Oxford has not fallen upon heedless ears. True, there is a moral side to the question; and I have never heard it more superbly stated than Mr. Diplock has stated it tonight. I compliment him upon the excellent manner in which it was done. The greatest tribute I can pay him is to say that he presented his cause *fairly*—so fairly, indeed, that I, for one, cannot charge him with having given us to debate a question which did not have two sides. And so at the risk of offending our guests, we venture to disagree.

We have heard from him of the bread lines, the sugar lines, in England and the rest of Europe—the great needs of those who wanted American goods, not American gold. These goods they were given; if the gentleman meant that the nations of Europe are *unable* to pay for them, his argument becomes one for debt cancelation—a question which is not involved in this debate. I can offer no effective rebuttal to the plea for cancelation: it is, I think, my own conviction and that of my colleagues that the debts incurred during the war should be canceled. But that, I repeat, is not the question. The nations of Europe have agreed to pay—not the principal of the war debts, but a small part of that principal and the interest on it, the greater part of the debts having been canceled—and are now seeking a method of payment. I refer to the resolution; that, under existing tariffs, the present method of payment is failing; and that there cannot be a successful collection of the war debts until those tariffs are reduced, by the United States.

Now, at the conclusion of Mr. Prettyman's speech, he told you of the great things you might expect to hear from me, in the way of solving this international financial and economic tangle. I hope he has not induced you to look upon me as some economic Messiah, coming to lead the world out of the slough of financial despond. At least, I shall not call Mr. Prettyman a voice crying in the wilderness. We are interested in the gentlemen from England. We know that one of them is a Liberal, another a Tory, and the other comes from old Ireland. As has been so classically remarked, "Politics makes strange bedfellows," but they rapidly become accustomed to the same bunk. One of these gentlemen is an accomplished cricket player. A doctor who is now practicing in London once asked me if we had the cricket bug over here yet. I told him that we had had it for a long time, and that it had the habit of furnishing unwelcome concerts when one is trying to sleep. I think he must have meant the English cousin of our familiar golf bug. Sometime I want Mr. Diplock to tell me the rules of this game of cricket; from what the eminent Mr. Charles Dickens has told us, it must be played in a very limited space, "Cricket on the Hearth." The annual importation of English humor is upon us, and we find the crop, on the whole, exceedingly good. The humor and wit which they are displaying we trust is not part of the traditions about which the second speaker told us. He expected the American speakers to shout "WOW"; but we really expected the gentlemen to stand upon our platform and begin a session of concentrated spoofing.

The essence of this problem has been laid before you; you have been told of the credit relation between the United States and the rest of the world—that the United States is creditor to the rest of the world to the extent of \$900,000,000 at the end of each year's business, because of the excess of goods sold by the United States to the rest of the world over the amount of goods purchased from the rest of the world each year. That the debts thus created cannot be liquidated until the United States reduces her tariffs is the sole issue presented by the Affirmative. They have pointed out that the world owes this country an additional sum of \$900,000,000 each year, and that this sum is re-loaned to debtor nations each year, in investments and outright loans, in order that they may continue to buy our goods. This is a staggering figure—a dismal picture of the rest of the world going further and further in debt to

the United States. We question how long this re-lending business will continue. There is authority to the effect that the figure quoted by the Affirmative as showing the total annual loans and investments is excessive. It will be found in the finance commission's report to President Hoover in the book *Recent Economic Changes*. But how long will American financial institutions continue thus to lend nearly a billion dollars additional each year? The total gold supply in the world is not over fourteen billions. At the re-lending rate quoted, the world's supply of gold would be exhausted in some sixteen years—and the United States controls only half that supply of gold. But is it gold we are lending each year?

A close examination discloses that it is not. It could not be—because we have not that quantity of gold to lend. This sum—which still continues to grow—represents not only the extension of *credit* to the debtor nations, but it represents American *investments* abroad, as well. A large part of the figure of \$900,000,000, cited by the Affirmative, can be explained by the recent actual investments made by Henry Ford in his European factory; by General Motors, in similar enterprises; by the Standard Oil Company, the United Fruit Company, and other organizations interested in the development of other markets and industrial regions. Payment of these huge investments is not demanded, of course—for the investors would simply turn around and re-invest in those nations which sought to repay their total investment debt. Investors do not seek repayment of the principal which they have invested; they are interested in the income from it. It is the continuing investments of American interests which have been classed under "Debts," and have been totalled with other loans to create the \$900,000,000 annual debt about which the gentlemen have spoken so much. Thus a large part of the enormous figure quoted cannot properly be called "Debt," because it is in the "Investment" class, which will perhaps never be sought to be collected.

As to the balance, we recall that Mr. MacKenna gave us credit for being able to collect our debts, at the same time criticising our methods. If it ever becomes apparent to American credit interests, who are lending money at the present time to the rest of the world, that there is little probability that such loans will be repaid, we give them credit for sufficient business sagacity to refuse to lend further, and begin to do one of two things: either call in outstanding loans, or proceed against the

collateral, or security, for the loans. In either case, with less money and less credit, the rest of the world will through necessity reduce its purchase of American goods, and thus reduce its indebtedness. By taxation—the method by which England and France are both raising the money to meet their yearly obligations to the United States—it is possible to obtain the money in each of the debtor nations. The question then becomes one of transferring this money to this country—which will be made possible with the decrease of world purchases in the American market—a decrease and eventual disappearance of the American export surplus, with the attendant increase in the availability of dollar exchange. This will make it possible for debtor nations to pay us in our own dollars, and the elimination of the debts will be but a matter of time. That this is not mere conjecture is proved by the fact that England, France, and other debtor nations are meeting their annual debt payments in precisely this way.

The question remains one of finding the most effective method of payment. Let me remind you, in closing, that nations owing this country have not only acknowledged and agreed to pay this honest debt, but have actually met the agreed payments as they have come due; thus demonstrating both their ability and their commendable willingness to pay. In the face of these facts, we feel justified in believing that this liquidation of the debts will continue until the whole is paid, without resorting to a reduction in our tariff, the beneficial results of which would be at best problematical.

DEAN TISDEL—By way of rebuttal, Mr. D. C. Cox will be permitted to speak for five minutes.

NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Donald C. Cox, Missouri

Mr. Acland and I cannot seem to get together on the tourist trade figure. His source of information, if you will recall, was the *Department of Commerce Bulletin* of 1928; my figure was taken from Professor Taussig's article in the November issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*, of this year, 1929, and Professor Taussig set the total figure at \$800,000,000. Now I admit

that to speak in round numbers, I set the amount at "nearly a billion dollars," and Mr. Acland, for the same reason no doubt, placed his at one half billion. Our intentions were good. We both were trying to be considerate of our audience. But it would seem, from a mathematical standpoint, that I have a million dollar edge on my friend, Mr. Acland. But what's a million dollars between friends, let alone nations.

Now the gentlemen from Oxford have strenuously attacked the American tariffs. They have admitted that our own George Washington would vote for their case if he were here tonight. We believe that their proposal to reduce the tariff is a radical and unnecessary one. You know we've had tariffs in this country ever since Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr had their little grudge fight over a hundred years ago. The tariffs have been an institution in our history. American business has, to some extent, depended upon them. Just as a man sits down—not because he is tired, but because the couch is there and he may as well use it. It is the psychology of suggestion, the very presence of a thing, which causes it to be considered. We have had our tariff policy for over a hundred years. We don't know whether it is a good or bad thing, nor are we concerned tonight with whether their method of payment or ours is the easier. We are not debating a question of comparative ease of payment. If the Negative can show you that, absolutely irrespective of the existing tariffs, the nations of Europe can pay their debts, we believe that we can expect that they will.

The opposition, in their main speeches, have spoken rather vaguely about some sort of reduction of the tariffs, as the panacea for our economic ills. They heartily endorse a "substantial reduction." But what do they mean by a "substantial reduction"? Do they mean to transfer our protective tariffs into competitive tariffs, with American goods endeavoring to compete with foreign goods? We are indeed curious to learn just what they meant by a "substantial reduction." Now don't let them come back to this platform and tell a joke, or two, or three, and then roguishly tell you that "substantial reduction" is to "reduce substantially." We have managed to gather that. We want them to tell you, "*how much*."

Now as a matter of plain fact, we have evidence which clearly shows that reductions of the tariff would not bring the Utopian results they claim. In our tariff history there have been

several periods: one notable one was in the Wilson administration, when our tariffs have been reduced. And statistics prove that with the lowering of the tariff there were little or no corresponding changes in imports. So we are inclined to believe that the Oxford case is built upon theory, witticism, and Mr. Diplock's oratory—a case that has not worked out in the past, and which we believe not to be necessary for the payment of our debts.

We have endeavored to point out tonight that our debtors can pay us in goods by means of the three cornered trade. That is, if France can't ship us her wines and beers, as much as we should like to have them, she can ship them to Brazil, who in turn will ship us coffee, an article on our free list. There is also the five and seven cornered trade. We have pointed out that \$4,500,000,000 worth of goods comes in on our free list, and \$1,500,000 *over the tariffs*. Thus nations can do enough business despite the tariffs to pay their debts. But outside of that we have shown that by means of tourist trade, immigrant remittances and other such items, our debtor nations take in four times the amount of their debt to us. We know that if all other sources were exhausted they could pay by taxation, and if they don't, the American taxpayer will have to. We know that France, with the largest army in the world, could pay her annual debt by reducing her standing and sitting army from 667,000 men to 66,000. We know that England could meet her payments by cutting down her government expense just 3 per cent. And I have heard it rumored that Italy is paying her obligations by issuing black shirts to her army and thereby saving on the government laundry bill. Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is our contention that our debtors *can* raise the money to pay this debt, and my colleagues have pointed out that it can be transferred in American dollars to the treasury of the United States.

Our friends have erred when they stoutly contend that debts are paid in *goods*. Our postmen can't take Italian peanuts for pay, you know. The money or, as we termed it, "the wealth to pay" may be raised in goods, but it must be handed to Secretary Mellon in dollars.

One thing more and I am through. Our friends have censured me for limiting the discussion to the war debts alone, and yet throughout their discussion they have confined themselves to these debts and no others. Mr. Diplock shrewdly utilized an

American characteristic and with a masterful emotional appeal, a word pageant, has mounted his soap-box and played upon the strings of our excessive nationalism. By the statement of the question, this question has no ethical or moral side. As we have constantly reminded you, it is not a case of whether we *should* collect these debts, but whether or not we *could* collect them with no changes in our tariff policy. Such, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have tried to make our case tonight, practical without the nebulous qualities of theory, and represented with straightforwardness uncolored by flag-waving emotionalism.

AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Richard T. D. Acland, Oxford

My opponents have mentioned, as I expected they would mention, a number of items of international trade which, they say, are alone bigger than the claims you have on Europe for war debts. Payments by tourists, payments by immigrants to their families at home, they say are big enough to meet the debt payments. They ask us whether we minimize these payments. Not at all, we simply cancel them out against the still bigger payments which the world has to make to you.

We look at the whole picture, not at a part of it, that's all. And in that picture we see the world owing you money, and every year you sending to the world goods, and rendering to the world services, of greater value than the goods and services which the world sends and renders to you, greater by nine hundred million dollars. If my estimate of the volume of tourist trade is wrong, as my opponents suggest, then this balance of payments must be reduced from nine hundred million to six hundred million,—the magnitude of the problem has changed, but not its nature,—and in addition I would point out that my figures are taken from an official government publication. Whatever the exact figure may be, the fact is that every year you are relending to the world a vast sum. How long is that situation to continue? What is to change it? For until it is changed, the opposite process, that of world repayment to you, cannot begin.

My opponents suggest that the world might stop purchasing your exports. But what are your exports? They are the goods

in the manufacture of which you have the greatest advantage over the rest of the world. What are the goods which you exclude by tariffs? They are the goods in the manufacture of which the world has the greatest advantages over you. The wording of this question asks you under what conditions you may "expect to have your debts paid." I suggest that it is unreasonable to assume that in order to receive payment you will cease to manufacture and export the things you make best, in order to bolster up and support the manufacture of the things you make the worst.

And so I ask again, what is likely to occur to change the present situation—to turn relending into repayment? Have my opponents suggested any change? They have suggested that tourist traffic might increase. I admit the possibility of some increase, but not to the extent of nine hundred million dollars. And against any probable increase I would set the probability of a decrease in immigrant remittances under the influence of your comparatively new laws restricting the number of immigrants.

In the absence of any other suggestion, I submit that the only solution of this difficulty lies in a lowering of the tariffs. My opponents suggest that a lowering of the tariffs would not increase the inflow of goods. If that is really so your senators ought to be done away with. What are they wasting time for if tariffs don't keep out goods? Of course they keep out goods—that is what they are made for.

We are asked by our opponents what we mean by a "substantial reduction." The only answer I can give is that by a substantial reduction we mean just that amount of reduction that would admit into this country an extra nine hundred million dollars worth of goods.

NEGATIVE REJOINDER

Albert L. Reeves, Missouri

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We seem to have been dealing with figures, this evening—very interesting figures, from a mathematical standpoint—and the result seems to be that we don't know whether the world owes the United States \$900,000,000 more each year, or only \$600,000,000. Whatever the figure is—we incline to believe the smaller is the correct one, but we will con-

cede the larger, for the purpose of argument—the gentlemen of the Affirmative have declared that that indebtedness cannot be paid until the tariff is reduced “substantially”—whatever they meant by that. Let me reiterate for the Negative that the tariff is not an embargo, since one and one-half billion dollars worth of goods upon which there are duties to be paid come into this country over the tariff wall—despite the tariff. Any reduction of foreign purchases of American goods—which reduction will occur, and is occurring, through necessity—will create an American debt to the rest of the world, through these imports into the United States, which can effectively be canceled against existing debts of foreign nations to the United States. A reduction of the purchasing power of foreign nations will come about and has come about because of the demands of American bankers that existing loans be paid, and a contemporaneous refusal to extend further credit. Payment of existing debts—which Mr. Cox has pointed out is possible through taxation—will further decrease their ability to buy American goods, and so enable them to meet their obligations. Somehow, we remain unconvinced that the nations are not effectively meeting their debt payments, as the treasury reports have shown.

The relending to foreign nations by the United States cannot continue forever. If it exists to any great degree, apart from the annual American investments abroad, it is creating a mounting economic inequality—a lack of balance between credit and debt—which the gentlemen have argued can and will continue. If there could be no other solution, eventually the whole expanded credit would fall of its own weight, compelling debtor nations to rely upon their own resources and meet their outstanding debts. Both sides are compelled to resort to conjecture, at this point; there is no way of knowing how long the process of relending will continue. Let me repeat that a major part of this so-called relending has taken the form of investment of American capital abroad, which cannot properly be classed as debts owing to the United States. As a matter of fact, once American capital is thus invested abroad, by that very investment it comes into the hands of foreign interests, individuals, and nations, to whom it is available as an enormous quantity of assets. In fact, by this process of investment abroad of American capital, the debtor nations find a source of money which of itself is sufficient to pay off their obligations.

We still believe, on the basis of the facts that debt payments are being made at present, regularly and without apparent strain, and the gradual return of the international economic structure to normal, that the nations of the world can and will meet their obligations to this country without first compelling us to reduce our protective tariff.

This is the conclusion of the debate. We have enjoyed the discussion with the gentlemen from Oxford more than we can express. Most of all, we have enjoyed the ready wit for which they have already become famous. It is ready, indeed—but they have not told us, and we have no means of finding out, just how long it has been ready.

DEAN TISDEL—Presumably before the debate you indicated your attitude on this question on the left side of the ballot. Will you now kindly give your present opinion on the other side of the ballot?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

FOREIGN DEBTS AND THE TARIFF

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:265-70. Ja. '29. Brief bibliography on tariff and international trade; comp. by H. T. Collings.
- Library Journal. 54:707-9. S. 1, '28. Foreign trade.
- United States. Bureau of foreign and domestic commerce. Publications of the Bureau of foreign and domestic commerce, September, 1928. The Bureau. Wash. D. C. '28.
- United States. Library of Congress. Tariff revision, 1929: a bibliographical list. 25p. mim. Wash. D. C. Ag. 13, '29.
- United States. Library of Congress. The tariff in its relation to the south, 1789-1923: a bibliographical list. 14p. typew. O. 9, '29. (To be obtained only thru Public Affairs Information Service, 11 W. 40th St. N.Y.)
- United States. Tariff commission. Subject index of United States Tariff commission publications. rev. O. '29. 38p. 10c. Supt. of documents. Wash. D. C. '29.
- United States. Trade commission. List of publications of the United States Trade commission; revised October, 1929. 38p. Wash. D. C. '29.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Academy of Political Science. America as a creditor nation. (Proceedings. vol. 12. no. 4) ed. by P. T. Moon. x, 173p. The Academy. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '28.
- Academy of Political Science. American foreign trade relations. (Proceedings. vol. 9. no. 2) \$1.50. The Academy. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '21.
- Anderson, B. M. Tariff in an unbalanced world. (Chase Econ Bull vol. 3. no. 5) Chase National Bank. N.Y. '23.

- Bastable, C. F. Theory of international trade, with some of its applications to economic policy. 4th ed. \$1.50. Macmillan. N.Y.
- Batten, Edward. Nationalism, politics and economics. 160p. 7s6d. P. S. King. Lond. '29.
- Carr, A. S. C. and Evans, D. R. Lure of safeguarding. 126p. 4s6d. George Allen and Unwin. Lond. '29.
- Crompton, George. Tariff; an interpretation of a bewildering problem. ix,266p. \$2.50. Macmillan. N.Y. '27.
- Culbertson, W. S. International economic policies; a survey of the economics of diplomacy. xviii,575p. \$3.50. D. Appleton. N.Y. '25.
- Dewey, D. R. Financial history of the United States. 8th ed. \$2.50. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '22.
- Donaldson, John. International economic relations; a treatise on world economy and politics. xxx,674p. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '28.
- Feis, Herbert. International finance and commerce. 36p. 10c. League of Nations Non-Partisan Assn. 6 E. 39th St. N.Y. '28.
- Filene, E. A. Mass production and the tariff. 7p. The Author. 5 Park Sq. Bost. '29.
- Foreign Policy Association. International tariff problem; a review of post-war European tariffs, and the text of the International bankers' manifesto. 35c. The Association. N.Y. '26.
- Gerig, Benjamin. Open door and the mandates system. 236p. 10s. George Allen and Unwin. Lond. '30.
- Gerould, J. T. and Turnbull, L. S. Selected articles on inter-allied debts and revision of the debt settlements. (Handbook Series II. vol. 4) xxxv,489p. \$2.40. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '28.
- Goss, J. D. History of tariff administration in the United States. (Columbia Univ. studies in history, economics and public law, no. 2) \$1.50. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y.
- Hawtrey, R. G. Trade and credit. vii,189p. \$4. Longmans, Green, N.Y. '28.
- Hecht, J. S. Unsolved problems: national and international. 288p. 16s. Jarrolds. Lond. '30.
- Hirst, F. W. Safeguarding and protection in Great Britain and the United States. xv,157p. \$2.75. Macmillan. N.Y. '27.

- Hollingshead, R. S. and others. Handbook of foreign tariffs and import regulations on agricultural products; canned foods in Europe. Trade promotion series 85. 287p. 45c. United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Wash. D. C. '29.
- Hollingshead, R. S. and Wakefield, R. P. Handbook of foreign tariffs and import regulations on agricultural products; fresh fruits and vegetables. Trade promotion series. 79:1-109. United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Wash. D. C. '29.
- International Chamber of Commerce. Trade series committee. Report. 33p. pa. 30c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '26.
- International conference for the abolition of import and export prohibitions and restrictions, 1927. Proceedings of the Conference held at Geneva October 17-November 8, 1927. 257p. \$2. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- International conference for the abolition of import and export prohibitions and restrictions, 1928. Proceedings. pa. \$1.20 World Foundation. Bost. '29.
- International conference on economic statistics, 1928. Proceedings of the conference held at Geneva, November 26-December 14, 1928. 361p. \$3. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '29.
- International financial position of the United States. 276p. National Industrial Conference Board, Inc. N.Y. '29.
- Kelsey, R. W. Tariff. (bibl.) 38p. Penny History Press. Haverford, Pa. '29.
- Kirkaldy, A. W. Romance of trade. new ed. rev. ix, 246p. \$2.10. E. P. Dutton. N.Y. '29.
- League of Nations. Commercial treaties; tariff systems and contractual methods. pa. 15p. 15c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '27.
- League of Nations. Memorandum on international trade and balances of payments, 1926-28. 107p. pa. \$1. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '30.
- League of Nations. Stability of customs tariffs. (International economic conference documentation) pa. 10c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '27.
- League of Nations. Tariff level indices. (International economic conference documentation, Geneva, 1927) 38p. 40c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '27.

- League of Nations. Economic and financial organization. Memorandum on balance of payments and for trade balances 1911-25. 2 vols. Vol. 1, \$1.25. Vol. 2, \$5. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '26-'27.
- League of Nations. Economic and financial organization. Memorandum on discriminatory tariff classifications. Transmitted by W. T. Page; submitted to the Preparatory committee. 11p. pa. 10c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '27.
- League of Nations. Economic and financial organization. Memorandum on production and trade, 1913 and 1923-27. pa. 50c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '29.
- League of Nations. Economic committee. Application of the international convention relating to the simplification of customs formalities; 1st-4th series. 4 vols. pa. 1st, 60c; 2d, 25c; 3d, 15c; 4th, 20c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- League of Nations. Economic committee. International conference for the conclusion of a tariff truce. 8p. pa. 15c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '29.
- Margalith, A. M. International mandates. (Johns Hopkins Univ. studies in history and political science. New series, no. 8) ix, 242p. \$2.50. Johns Hopkins Univ. Balt.
- Matsushita, S. Economic effects of public debts. 186p. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '29.
- Maxwell, L. W. Discriminating duties and the American merchant marine. x, 238p. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '26.
- National Foreign Trade Council. World's export trade recovery from the war. 14p. gratis. The Council. 1 Hanover Sq. N.Y. '28.
- Olsen, N. A. Foreign markets for agricultural products and the competition of foreign agricultural producers in our foreign and domestic markets. 17p. mim. United States Bureau of Agriculture. Wash. D.C.
- Pratt, E. E. International trade in staple commodities. viii, 570p. \$5. McGraw-Hill. N.Y. '28.
- Price, M. P. Economic problems of Europe, pre-war and after. 6-218p. \$3.50. Macmillan. N.Y. '28.
- Pringle, W. H., ed. Economic problems in Europe today. xi, 146p. \$2. Macmillan. N.Y. '28.
- Ramsay, Alexander. The economics of safe-guarding. 304p. 8s 6d. Ernest Benn. Lond. '30.

- Roberts, J., comp. Meat production, consumption and foreign trade in the United States, calendar years 1900-28. 9p. mim. United States Dept. of Agriculture. Bureau of Animal Husbandry. Wash. D.C.
- Tariff Act of 1929. 315p. United States. Govt. Ptg. Off. Wash. D.C. '29.
- Tariff bill of 1929. 366p. United States. Govt. Ptg. Office. Wash. D.C. '29.
- United States. Chamber of Commerce. Foreign Commerce Dept. International convention for the abolition of import restrictions. 20p. Chamber of Commerce. Wash. D.C. '28.
- United States. Tariff Commission. Tariffs in certain foreign countries. 50p. The Commission. Wash. D.C. '29.
- Whaley-Eaton Service. Coalition's ultimatum; Senator Borah's speech of September 16, 1929. (Pamphlet vol. 5. no. 2) 37p. 25c. The Service. Munsey Bldg. Wash. D.C. '29.

PERIODICALS

- Academy of Political Science. Proceedings. 13:225-36. Ja. '29. Effect of the abolition of war upon commercial policies. B. B. Wallace.
- Academy of Political Science. Proceedings. 13:301-9. Ja. '29. Peace and world trade. N. H. Davis.
- Academy of Political Science. Proceedings. 13:468-86. Ja. '30. New measures of the relations of credit and trade. Carl Snyder.
- American Bankers' Association Journal. 22:475+. N. '29. War debts and home markets. T. N. Carver.
- American Economic Review. 15:700-16. D. '25. War debts and international trade.
- American Economic Review. 19:sup.140-54. Mr. '29. Tariff-making in the United States; round table discussion.
- American Economic Review. 20:210-25. Je. '30. Tariff and organized labor. L. W. Cooper.
- American Historical Review. 35:276-94. Ja. '30. Tariff and reconstruction. H. K. Beale.
- American Industries. 29:3-11. N. '28. Taking the politics out of the tariff.

- American Industries. 29:3-29. Mr. '29. Broad presentation of the tariff question including the constitution and operation of the present Tariff commission.
- American Industries. 30:6-30. Ag. '29. Brief in support of tariff bill provisions.
- American Industries. 30:40-51. O. '29. Legislative enactments and business development; flexible tariff. J. A. Emery.
- American Journal of International Law. 23:816-19. O. '29. Tariff as a matter of international concern. A. K. Kuhn.
- American Journal of International Law. 24:110-18. Ja. '30. Tariff relations with France. E. C. Stowell.
- American Mercury. 18:70-3. S. '29. Favorable balance of trade. H. G. Hayes.
- Annalist. 34:909-11. N. 8 '29. Unbalanced protectionism endangers world peace: uniform tariffs needed. W. H. Stivers.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 120:51-8. Jl. '25. Economic significance of interallied debts.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 135:189-250. Ja. '28. Great Britain's recent trend toward protection. R. A. Young.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:1-270. Ja. '29. Tariff problems of the United States. ed. by H. T. Collings.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:1-10. Ja. '29. Basis of international trade. H. T. Collings.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:43-8. Ja. '29. Mass production and the tariff. E. A. Filene.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:53-60. Ja. '29. Popular tariff fallacies. H. F. Fraser.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:137-48. Ja. '29. Is the agricultural tariff protective? J. M. Gersting.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:175-80. Ja. '29. Tariff policy of creditor nations; with especial reference to the tariff history of leading creditor nations during the 19th century. Max Winkler.

- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:204-11. Ja. '29. British imperial preference and the American tariff. R. A. Young.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 141:212-19. Ja. '29. Franco-American tariff problem. H. R. Enslow.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 142:329-33. Mr. '29. Attitude of the National Grange toward the tariff. J. L. Taber.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:55-8. Jl. '29. Equality of belligerents and the embargo resolutions. J. P. Chamberlain.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:70-2. Jl. '29. Tariff handicaps. J. E. Boyle.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:73-5. Jl. '29. Tariff of today. H. W. Watson.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:76-9. Jl. '29. International problems of the tariff. H. T. Collings.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:80-4. Jl. '29. Tariff policy of the United States as affecting our relations with Canada. W. W. McLaren.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 149:67-73. My. '30. Business and world peace. Samuel Colcord.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 149:82-7. My. '30. Position of the United States in world affairs. J. H. Rogers.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 150:126-45. Jl. '30. Current trends in foreign policy. Henry Chalmers.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 150:154-61. Jl. '30. Commercial policies and tariffs in their relation to world peace. E. B. Brossard.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 150:162-6. Jl. '30. American economic policy. A. P. Dennis.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 150:179-85. Jl. '30. Basis of international cooperation. Norman Thomas.

- Atlantic Monthly. 137:113-18. Ja. '26. Capacity to pay. C. A. Herter.
- Atlantic Monthly. 142:13-22. Jl. '28. Are we playing the game? G. E. Putnam.
- Atlantic Monthly. 143:680-7. My. '29. Deepening tariff darkness. P. T. Homan.
- Banker. 14:47-54. Ap. '30. International American banking. H. P. Willis.
- Barron's. 10:3+. F. 17, '30. Europe's defence against American tariffs. Alzada Comstock.
- Barron's. 10:13. Mr. 24, '30. Tariff barriers. L. J. Reid.
- Bradstreet's. 58:254. Ap. 12, '30. Eleven countries sign tariff truce.
- Bureau Farmer (Pennsylvania ed.) 5:14. O. '29. What the Smoot-Hawley bill would do to American agriculture.
- Business Week. p. 3-4. S. 7, '29. Tariff racket begins.
- Business Week. p. 3-4. O. 5, '29. Flexible tariff broken by Senate.
- Business Week. p. 52. O. 12, '29. Tariff nuisance.
- Business Week. p. 4. O. 26, '29. Senate set to tackle tariff rates; debenture plan and summary of the more important administrative features of the bill.
- Business Week. p. 3-4. N. 20, '29. There isn't going to be any tariff bill.
- Business Week. p. 4. Ja. 8, '30. Free trade steps forward and back.
- Business Week. p. 8. Ja. 15, '30. Europe to talk tariff truce while we listen.
- Business Week. p. 15. Ja. 29, '30. Await our tariff before shifting trade to Great Britain.
- Business Week. p. 7. F. 5, '30. Firing on the flag of tariff truce.
- Business Week. p. 6-7. F. 12, '30. Leading business men disgusted with the tariff.
- Business Week. p. 7. F. 19, '30. Australian tariff hits our products.
- Business Week. p. 7. Mr. 5, '30. Tariff conference has an eye on us.
- Business Week. p. 7. Ap. 2, '30. Europe makes a temporary truce.

- Business Week. p. 37. Ap. 2, '30. What the House and Senate have done to the tariff.
- Business Week. p. 7. Ap. 9, '30. Tariff truce has friendly press.
- Business Week. p. 31-2. Ap. 9, '30. What big business men think of the tariff bill.
- Business Week. p. 5. Ap. 16, '30. French minister drops a bomb into the tariff celebration.
- Business Week. p. 7. My. 28, '30. Tariff soon goes to President.
- Business Week. p. 25-7. Jl. 2, '30. New tariff cannot affect the total of our foreign trade.
- Canadian Forum. 10:45-6. N. '29. Will of the people. E. McInnis.
- Century. 120:45-57. Ja. '30. Self-interest and the tariff. Jacob Viner.
- Collier's. 77:20. My. 29, '26. Nothing but money.
- Collier's. 84:8-9. Ag. 24, '29. Please pass the gravy, with foreword by Senator Borah. C. W. Gilbert.
- Collier's. 84:58. Ag. 24, '29. Wake up the tariff dodoes.
- Commerce and Finance. 18:850-1. Ap. 17, '29. The staggering accretion of national debt. M'Cready Sykes.
- Commerce Reports. no. 1, p. 12. Ja. 6, '30. Nineteen countries provisionally agree to end trade restrictions. Henry Chalmers.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 128:3037-8. Je. 15, '29. Status of Allied debts to the United States unchanged.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 128:4082-3. Je. 22, '29. Payment of \$80,109,385 made to the United States by great Britain and other foreign nations on account of war debt.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 129:1679-80, 2005-7, 2169-70, 2332-4, 2842-4, 2624-6, 2954-7. S. 14, 28; O. 12, 26; N. 9, 19, '29. Senate action on the tariff bill.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 129:1973-4. S. 28, '29. Tariff-union in Europe; its effect on the United States.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 129:3109-11, 3258-61, 3412, 3734-5; 130:229-30, 401-2, 569, 737-9, 915-17, 1062-3, 1211-13, 1374-6, 1580-2, 1758-9, 1958-60. N. 16-30; D. 14, '29; Ja. 11-Mr. 22, '30. Tariff question.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 130:3101-2. My. 3, '30. Tariff on farm products will effect material increases in costs to consumer.

- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 130:3247-9. My. 10, '30.
American economists and the Smoot-Hawley tariff; editorial.
Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 130:4352-3. Je. 21, '30.
History of tariff bill of 1930. C. F. Moore.
Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 130:sup. 1-40. Je. 21 '30.
The tariff: full text, approved June 17, 1930.
Commonweal. 9:319-20. Ja. 16, '29. Tariff for the farmer.
Henry Thien.
Commonweal. 10:123-5. Je. 5, '29. Case for tariff revision.
John Carter.
Commonweal. 10:273-5. Jl. 10, '29. Our orphaned investments.
John Carter.
Commonweal. 10:303-4. Jl. 24, '29. Tariff in bad weather.
Commonweal. 10:329-31. Jl. 31, '29. America for Americans.
Elmer Murphy.
Commonweal. 10:362. Ag. 7, '29. With an eye on the tariff.
F. Reynolds.
Commonweal. 10:363. Ag. 7, '29. Our orphaned investments;
reply. M. P. Connery.
Commonweal. 10:377-8. Ag. 14, '29. Tariff while the sun
shines. W. C. Murphy.
Commonweal. 11:639-40. Ap. 9, '30. Billion-dollar gamble.
Commonweal. 12:93-4. My. 28, '30. Tariff teetotalism.
Congressional Digest. 8:161-77. Je. '29. Making a tariff law.
Congressional Digest. 8:178-81. Je. '29. Should the President
be given further powers to adjust the tariff rates?
Congressional Digest. 8:182. Je. '29. Should foreign valuation
govern application of United States tariff rates?
Congressional Digest. 8:208-9. Ag. '29. An attitude toward
reparations. L. W. Jones.
Contemporary Review. 134:545-52. N. '28. Battle for free
trade. J. M. Robertson.
Contemporary Review. 137:137-48. F. '30. Empire free trade?
Sir Herbert Louis Samuel.
Country Gentleman. 95:20-1+. Ap. '30. Tariff making. A. P.
Dennis.
Current History. 28:331-2. My. '28. North and South China
preparing for tariff autonomy. H. S. Quigley.
Current History. 29:993-8. Mr. '29. Tariff as a cause of Porto
Rican poverty. H. S. Sloan.

- Current History. 30:493-8. Je. '29. Congress tackles farm relief and tariff revision.
- Current History. 31:158-61. O. '29. Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. A. B. Hart.
- Current History. 32:557-8. Je. '30. Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.
- Current Opinion. 78:137-8. F. '25. Confusing Uncle Sam with Shylock.
- Dun's International Review. 54:35-7+. N. '29. Historical review of the growth of overseas commerce. D. F. McGarry.
- Economic Review. 16: sup.88-112. Mr. '26. Economic problems involved in payment of international debts.
- Economist. 108:1097-8. My. 18, '29. Tariff question in Europe and America.
- Economist. 109:213-16. Ag. 3, '29. Tables relating to reparations and inter-allied debts.
- Economist. 110:764-5. Ap. 5, '30. Tariff truce convention.
- Economist. 110:815. Ap. 12, '30. Tariffs in theory and practice.
- Editorial Research Reports. 2:255-67. Ap. 10, '30. European tariff truce negotiations. Felix Morley.
- Electric World. 94:668. S. 28, '29. European economic union and tariff policies.
- Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine (London, Canada) 65: 112. Ja. 23, '30. Up with the tariff walls! H. H. Dean.
- Forbes Magazine. 24:64-5. Jl. 1, '29. How Europe views tariff. John Carter.
- Forbes Magazine. 24:83+. O. 1, '29. Europe looks at America; proposed European economic union overshadows United States tariff in foreign press. John Carter.
- Forbes Magazine. 24:28+. O. 15, '29. Why Europe's economic union is desirable. John Carter.
- Foreign Affairs. 7:497-9. Ap. '29. China's new tariff autonomy. W. H. Mallory.
- Foreign Affairs. 8:1-12. O. '29. The tariff bill and our friends abroad. F. W. Taussig.
- Foreign Affairs. 8:13-19. O. '29. European reactions to American tariff proposals. André Siegfried.
- Foreign Policy Association. Information Service. 5:121-38. Je. 12, '29. Tariff and American foreign trade. L. W. Jones.
- Foreign Policy Association. Information Service. 5:458-60. F. 5, '30. Tariffs and international agreements. H. D. Gideonese.

- Harvard Business School Alumni Bulletin. 5:63-8; 111-14; 153-9; 199-205. D. '28-My. '29. A hundred years of United States tariffs. W. M. Coddington.
- Institute of International Relations. Proceedings. 4:40-2. '29. American industrial efficiency and the tariff. H. F. Grady.
- International Review of Agriculture. 19:773-9. S. '28. Marketing of agriculture produce; a special method of determining customs dues for agricultural products. W. Krzywicki.
- Journal of Farm Economics. 12:80-106. Ja. '30. Analysis of tariff duties; with discussion. J. D. Black.
- Journal of Political Economy. 37:604-16. O. '29. Economic equality and the Mandates Commission. E. C. Jenkins.
- Ladies' Home Journal. 43:13. D. '29. Am I blue? Housewife's interest in national legislation.
- Literary Digest. 85:5-7. My. 30, '25. Leading minds tell how to handle European debts.
- Literary Digest. 86:19-20. Ag. 1, '25. John Bull as a collector.
- Literary Digest. 90:5-7. Jl. 31, '26. Uncle Shylock's reply to his critics.
- Literary Digest. 93:96. Je. 4, '27. How the war debts must be paid.
- Literary Digest. 100:5-7. Mr. 9, '29. Presenting the tariff tinkers of '29.
- Literary Digest. 100:84. Mr. 16, '29. Forecast of the Hawley-Smoot tariff.
- Literary Digest. 101:8-9. Ap. 27, '29. Mr. Hoover's acid test of tariff protection.
- Literary Digest. 101:15-16. Ap. 27, '29. Tariff panic along the Canadian border.
- Literary Digest. 101:64-5. Ap. 27, '29. Why the tariff is touchy.
- Literary Digest. 101:5-7. My. 18, '29. Tariff fat in the fire.
- Literary Digest. 101:13-14. My. 25, '29. As Canada sees our tariff cat out of the bag.
- Literary Digest. 101:5-7. Je. 8, '29. Storm centers in the new tariff.
- Literary Digest. 102:5-7. Jl. 20, '29. Shouting down our tariff wall.
- Literary Digest. 102:12. Jl. 27, '29. Lower tariff on automobiles?

- Literary Digest. 102:14-15. Jl. 27, '29. World war against Uncle Sam's new tariff.
- Literary Digest. 102:56. Jl. 27, '29. Ups and downs of tariff revision.
- Literary Digest. 102:9. Ag. 31, '29. Tariff wrangle just beginning.
- Literary Digest. 102:15. S. 7, '29. Canadian tariff meditations.
- Literary Digest. 102:22. S. 14, '29. Our unfriendly tariff bill.
- Literary Digest. 102:10-11. S. 21, '29. Tax publicity as an anti-tariff club.
- Literary Digest. 103:10-11. O. 5, '29. New blocs that block the new tariff.
- Literary Digest. 103:85-6. O. 5, '29. Will there be three great customs unions?
- Literary Digest. 103:8-9. O. 12, '29. Senate's slap at the president.
- Literary Digest. 103:7-9. N. 2, '29. Tariff fight that may wreck parties.
- Literary Digest. 103:15. D. 14, '29. Canadian support for Hoover's trade campaign.
- Literary Digest. 104:12. F. 8, '30. France's tariff tit for tat.
- Literary Digest. 105:11-12. Ap. 5, '30. Senate's tariff idea.
- Literary Digest. 105:14-15. Je. 28, '30. Uncle Sam's tariff unpopularity.
- Literary Digest. 106:15. Jl. 5, '30. Germany's ire at our tariff.
- Living Age. 336:274-6. Je. '29. Open letter to President Hoover and an economic plan for European peace. R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi.
- Living Age. 336:332. Jl. '29. American attitude toward reparations. L. W. Jones.
- Living Age. 338:567-9. Jl. 15, '30. European opinion of the new American tariff.
- Magazine of Business. 55:391-2. Ap. '29. New tariff, a limited revision.
- Magazine of Business. 55:543. My. '29. How much will farm product protection cost business? J. H. Millar.
- Manufacturers' Record. 95:49-50. Mr. 28, '29. Farmers demand higher tariff, and the reasons therefor.
- Nation. 126:376-7. Ap. 4, '28. Democrats and the tariff in 1928. J. N. Aiken.

- Nation. 128:218. F. 20, '29. Mr. Hoover and Mr. Grundy.
- Nation. 128:250-1. F. 27, '29. High tariff diplomacy. Drew Pearson.
- Nation. 128:356. Mr. 20, '29. Philippines and the tariff. Randall Gould.
- Nation. 128:423-4. Ap. 10, '29. Barrier to balanced trade. Drew Pearson.
- Nation. 129:136-7. Ag. 7, '29. License to steal. W. C. Murphey, jr.
- Nation. 129:238. S. 4, '29. Smash it!
- Nation. 129:401-2. O. 16, '29. Flexing down the tariff.
- Nation. 129:572. N. 20, '29. Protection swindle.
- Nation. 129:579-80. N. 20, '29. Pity the poor tariff. P. Y. Anderson.
- Nation. 130:115. Ja. 29, '30. Buncoing the farmer.
- Nation. 130:231. F. 26, '30. Burden of war debts.
- Nation. 130:318-19. Mr. 19, '30. Tariff vote market. H. R. Mussey.
- Nation. 130:354-5. Mr. 26, '30. My dear senator; on a certain betrayal in Washington.
- Nation. 130:358-9. Mr. 26, '30. Old Joe's senate. P. Y. Anderson.
- Nation. 130:589-90. My. 21, '30. Sowing the wind.
- Nation. 130:592. My. 21, '30. Nation's tariff poll.
- Nation. 130:618. My. 28, '30. Veto the tariff!
- Nation. 130:619-20. My. 28, '30. My dear senator. O. G. Villard.
- Nation. 130:641. Je. 4, '30. Who wants the tariff?
- Nation. 130:648. Je. 4, '30. Will the President listen? summary of returns in the tariff poll.
- National Republic. 17:12-13. S. '29. Tariff for Americans.
- National Republic. 17:12-13. N. '29. Tariff, a labor question.
- National Republic. 17:13. Ap. '30. Our tariff and the League of Nations.
- National Republic. 18:13. My. '30. Outcry against the tariff.
- National Republic. 18:12. Je. '30. Foreign tariff protests.
- National Republic. 18:13. Je. '30. Capitalist internationalism; international levelers.
- New Republic. 43:62-3. Ja. 10, '25. Tariff and the debts.
- New Republic. 43:169-70. Jl. 8, '25. How can we be repaid?
- New Republic. 43:278-9. Ag. 5, '25. Prices, tariffs, and international debts.

- New Republic. 47:293-5. Ag. 4, '26. Behind the debt controversy.
- New Republic. 54:313-14. My. 2, '28. Bankers plan for reparation.
- New Republic. 55:238-40. Jl. 25, '28. Ninety-five per cent buncombe.
- New Republic. 56:47-8. Ag. 29, '28. Wages and tariffs; reply to Ninety-five per cent buncombe, with rejoinder. A. L. Faubel.
- New Republic. 56:60-2. S. 5, '28. Menace of tariff revision.
- New Republic. 56:261-2. O. 24, '28. Taking the tariff out of politics.
- New Republic. 57:178-9. Ja. 2, '29. We make a tariff.
- New Republic. 57:288-90. Ja. 30, '29. Can the tariff help the farmer? Robert Stewart.
- New Republic. 58:292-3. My. 1, '29. Hoover's debenture decalogue.
- New Republic. 59:4-5. My. 22, '29. Pandora's tariff.
- New Republic. 59:91-2. Je. 12, '29. Tariff lesson from Canada. R. J. Deachman.
- New Republic. 59:96-7, 124-5; 60:124-5, 242-3. Je. 12-19, S. 18, O. 16, '29. Washington notes.
- New Republic. 59:165-6. Jl. 3, '29. Tariff and the innocent bystander.
- New Republic. 59:198-9. Jl. 10, '29. Mr. Woll on the tariff. M. A. Heyman.
- New Republic. 59:286. Jl. 31, '29. Sorrows of Herbert. Felix Ray.
- New Republic. 60:35-7. Ag. 28, '29. Do manufacturers need relief? S. H. Slichter.
- New Republic. 60:283-4. O. 30, '29. The logic of the debenture.
- New Republic. 61:6-7. N. 27, '29. Mr. Hoover against the world.
- New Republic. 61:31-2. D. 4, '29. Return to Europe.
- New Republic. 62:151-2, 218-19. Mr. 26, Ap. 9, '30. Washington notes.
- New Republic. 62:176-7. Ap. 2, '30. Tariff tragedy.
- New Republic. 62:323-5. My. 7, '30. Hard times for the farmers; what can the tariff do? R. R. Renne.
- New Republic. 62:338-9. My. 14, '30. Experts speak.
- New Republic. 63:29. My. 28, '30. Special privileges to minority at the expense of the nation.

- New Republic. 63:41-2. My. 28, '30. Washington notes; Hoover and the tariff bill.
- New Republic. 63:57-8. Je. 4, '30. Fraud of the flexible tariff.
- New Republic. 63:182-3. Jl. 2, '30. Hoover and the tariff. M. M. Johnson.
- New Statesman. 33:462-3. Jl. 20, '29. American tariff. Discussion. 33:494, 523. Jl. 27-Ag. 3, '29.
- Nineteenth Century and After. 100:321-34. S. '26. America, Quixote or Shylock? A. W. Tilby.
- North American Review. 228:273-80. S. '29. Is the tariff fair to farmers? Theodore Christianson.
- North American Review. 228:574-80. N. '29. Penny that blinds. G. R. Parker.
- North American Review. 228:698-704. D. '29. Thingography; amazing interdependence of world consumers. O. K. Davis.
- North American Review. 230:18-24. Jl. '30. Revolt against the tariff. W. O. Scroggs.
- Outlook and Independent. 152:2-5. My. 1, '29. Which way Hoover. H. K. Norton.
- Outlook and Independent. 152:51-3. My. 8, '29. As the Filipino sees it. Walter Robb.
- Outlook and Independent. 152:133. My. 22, '29. Higher tariff walls.
- Outlook and Independent. 152:243-5. Je. 12, '29. Understanding the tariff. H. K. Norton.
- Outlook and Independent. 152:505. Jl. 24, '29. New era in world affairs.
- Outlook and Independent. 152:683-5. Ag. 28, '29. Does our tariff menace peace? H. W. Steed.
- Outlook and Independent. 154:579-80. Ap. 9, '30. Sky-limited tariffs.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:174-5. Je. 4, '30. Tariff bill.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:245-8. Je. 18, '30. Tragedy of the tariff; its economic and moral implications. P. M. Mazur.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:334-5. Jl. 2, '30. Protests from abroad; Hopeless; editorials.
- Pan-American Magazine. 42:149-53. O. '29. Some economic and political viewpoints.
- Publishers' Weekly. 116:2919. D. 28, '29. As the tariff stands.
- Quarterly Journal of Economics. 44:175-204. F. '30. The tariff, 1929-30. F. W. Taussig.

- Quarterly Journal of Economics. 44:381-415. My. '30. Equilibrium economics and business-cycle theory. Simon Kuznets.
- Queen's Quarterly. 37:397-405. Ap. '30. Assize of Demos. F. C. Mears.
- Review of Reviews. 75:617-24. Ja. '27. Debts, disarmament, and economics. F. H. Simonds.
- Review of Reviews. 79:47-50. My. '29. Higher duties or better friends? F. H. Simonds.
- Review of Reviews. 80:31-4. S. '29. Affair of national policy.
- Review of Reviews. 80:40-2. O. '29. Senate now talks tariff.
- Review of Reviews. 81:39-42. F. '30. Hundreds of years of tariff talk.
- Review of Reviews. 81:23-4. Je. '30. Economists against higher tariffs. Albert Shaw.
- Review of Reviews. 82:21-5. Jl. '30. Reasons against a tariff veto. Albert Shaw.
- Review of Reviews. 82:52-5. Jl. '30. New tariff: a defense. W. C. Hawley.
- Royal Statistical Society Journal. 92:pt.4. 487-529. '29. Measurement of tariff levels. A. Loveday.
- St. Nicholas. 56:733-4. Jl. '29. Tariff and tariff making; effects of our tariff abroad.
- Saturday Evening Post. 200:31. D. 10, '27. European trade barriers. A. R. Dennis.
- Saturday Evening Post. 201:29. Je. 15, '29. Tariff, a two-edged sword. A. P. Dennis.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:14-15. Jl. 6, '29. Nationalistic business; economic propaganda. I. F. Marcossou.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:44-7. S. 21, '29. Protectors of the poor; a drama in the manner of the Moscow Art Theater. K. L. Roberts.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:25. N. 23, '29. Ol' debbil tariff. S. G. Blythe.
- Scientific American. 135:432. D. '26. How the nations will pay us their war debts.
- Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly. 8:338-43; 10:429-31. Mr. '28, Mr. '30. Classical theory of international trade. C. R. Fay.
- Spectator. 144:115-16, 152-3, 187-9, 223-4, 275-6. Ja. 25-F. 22, '30. Free trade in 1930.

- Swedish-American Trade Journal. 23:338-40. O. '29. European customs union? Bertil Ohlin.
- Textile World. 76:1839-40. S. 28, '29. European tariffs and their bearing on our domestic situation.
- United States Daily. sup.1-16. Mr. 26, '30. 10c. Complete official text of the dutiable list of the proposed Tariff Act of 1929 as passed by the senate.
- United States Egg and Poultry Magazine. 36:15. My. '30. Hawley-Smoot tariff.
- United States. Year Book of Agriculture. 1928:1015-35. '29. Foreign trade of the United States in agricultural products.
- Wallace's Farm and Iowa Homestead. 54:1398. O. 18, '29. Cutting down the tariff.
- Wallace's Farm and Iowa Homestead. 55:476. Mr. 8, '30. Tariff bill without friends.
- Wallace's Farm and Iowa Homestead. 55:681. Ap. 5, '30. Worst tariff bill passes.
- Woman's Journal. 14:26. Je. '29. Towering tariff.
- Woman's Journal. 14:7-9. O. '29. Tariff, can we afford it? A. O. McCormick.
- Woman's Journal. 14:18-19. N. '29. Your business in Washington. C. I. Hackett.
- Woman's Journal. 15:22. My. '30. Price of the tariff.
- Woman's Journal. 15:22. Je. '30. Tariff trouble-maker; editorial.
- World Tomorrow. 12:355. S. '29. Nations don't like our tariff.
- World Tomorrow. 13:59-62. F. '30. Future of the tariff. L. W. Cooper.
- World Tomorrow. 133:245. Je. '30. Economists on the tariff.
- World's Work. 58:156-9. Je. '29. Tariff changes. W. C. Hawley.
- World's Work. 58:26-31. S. '29. Tariff fight looms.
- World's Work. 59:20. My. '30. Needed, the flexible clause.
- Yale Review. 19:269-79. D. '29. Present phase of the war debts. G. B. Winston.

CHAPTER II

THE CHAIN STORE SYSTEM

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

versus

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

RESOLVED: *That the principle of the chain store system is detrimental to the best interests of the United States public.*

This debate took place between representatives of Northwestern University for the Affirmative and the State University of Iowa for the Negative, on the night of December 12, 1929, in the Harris Hall Auditorium at Northwestern University. It was one of the first series of contests of the Western Conference Debate League for 1929-1930. Of the nine contests the Negative won five times and the Affirmative four. Professor A. T. Weaver, Chairman of the Department of Speech of the University of Wisconsin, acted as Critic Judge, deciding in favor of the Negative.

This debate and also the bibliography by Miss Eleanor F. Lewis, was secured for publication thru the kind assistance of Professor C. C. Cunningham of Northwestern University.

BRIEF

THE CHAIN STORE SYSTEM

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION

- A. The period of chain store development is confined to the years from 1921 to the present.
 - 1. It had its inception in 1859 with the organization of the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company.
 - 2. Before 1921, however, chain stores were not of particular importance in the retailing field.
 - a. In that year, they accounted for only 2 per cent of the retail business done in the United States.
 - 3. In 1928 chain stores did 19 per cent of the business.
 - a. This amount was increased 21 per cent during the first six months of 1929.
- B. Definition of terms.
 - 1. Principle of the chain store system.
 - a. The system is defined according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* as
 - (1) "A number of unit retail stores operating under a common ownership and management and following common policies and utilizing common methods which are determined by central management."
 - b. The principle involves two essential elements.
 - (1) Unit of centralized management.
 - (2) Concentrated ownership with a resulting concentration of profits.
 - c. It does not include any forms of organization among independent dealers for collective buying or any other purpose aside from centralized ownership.

2. The term, "detrimental to the best interests of the people of the United States,"

The Affirmative take to mean that

- (1) The chain store, in working out its essential principle, will redound to the injury of the American people in the long run.

C. The issues are

1. Is the application of the principle of the chain store by its very nature a dangerous trend in the field of distribution?
 2. Is it detrimental economically?
 3. Is it detrimental socially?
- I. The principle of the chain store is by its very nature a dangerous trend in the field of retail distribution.
- A. It represents a dangerous concentration in retail ownership, leading toward quasi-monopoly.
1. There are at the present time about 3,700 chain store systems owning about 100,000 units.
 2. In 1928, chain store sales were in excess of eight billion dollars.
 3. One-half of 1 per cent of the grocery chains in this country control almost 50 per cent of the chain store grocery business.
- B. Its very efficiency makes it all the more dangerous in this direction.
1. An ever-increasing market is secured by encouraging manufacturers to create private and unknown brands at low prices.
 - a. Standard brands must then be sold at higher prices in order that these manufacturers may realize a profit on operations.
 2. There is an increasing tendency for chain stores to do their own manufacturing.
 - a. Bread making, by the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company, is one example.
 3. Mergers are an established part of the process of concentration of ownership.
 - a. Many of the large companies are mergers of many small companies.
 - b. And the period of mergers seems to be only at its beginning.

4. Price-cutting is the most insidious and most effective of the chain store methods toward destruction of competition.
 - a. Standard brands are sold at cut-throat prices.
 - (1) Often the loss is made up by selling the private or unknown brands at excessive prices.
 - b. It has been declared so by Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court.
 - c. Representative Kelly of Pennsylvania, speaking before the House, denounced chain-store price cutting as an unfair method of putting the small retailer out of business.
- II. The chain store is detrimental to the best interests of the people of the United States economically.
 - A. It is threatening to put the independent retailer out of business.
 1. This will hurt not only the merchant, but his employes, their families, and all who are economically dependent upon him.
 - B. It is fighting a better system—independent retail organizations with powers of mass buying.
 1. These organizations possess the advantages both of the chain store and the independent merchant.
 2. Every cent the chain store takes from this system is an economic detriment.
 - C. The chain store is having a dangerous trend in the field of credit.
 1. It is sending money earned in small rural and semi-urban communities to a few large cities.
 - a. It is concentrating what ought to be fluid in the hands of a few.
 - D. It presents every element of a quasi-monopoly, in that it has centralized control of
 1. Production.
 2. Wholesale distribution.
 3. Retail distribution.
 4. Distribution of profits.
- III. The chain store is detrimental to the best interests of the people of the United States socially.

- A. It makes an employe of the independent man and robs him of his initiative.
 - 1. The chains are manned by individuals of a more mechanized routine type.
- B. It will mean a concentration of political power in a few hands and a few places.
 - 1. By concentrating wealth in a few large cities the chain store is also concentrating political power in a few hands.
 - a. It is a well-established law of political science that wealth and power go together.
 - b. The chain stores send their money to the big cities.
 - (1) Their accounts are not carried to any profitable extent in country banks.
 - (2) Unequal distribution of credit is the result.
 - (a) The big problem facing the Federal Reserve Board today is that of rehabilitating credit in small communities.
- C. It is charged that chain stores do not share in the local interests or obligations of the community.
 - 1. They do not have the interest in the community that the independent merchant has, whose home, family and social connections make him inevitably a part of it.

NEGATIVE

- I. The chain stores are founded on sound economic principles.
 - A. The eight billions of dollars of business are coming almost entirely from 65 per cent of the American people.
 - 1. This is the wage earning class.
 - B. The need for the application of the chain store principle existed.
 - 1. At the close of the war no outlet remained for the big production manufacturers had attained.
 - a. The result was unemployment, and the panic of 1921-1922.

- C. By inaugurating centralized control the chain stores were able to meet this need.
 - 1. Overhead costs were reduced.
 - a. Executive ability and efficiency could be extended from one to a large number of stores.
 - b. Great savings were effected thru buying in quantities.
 - (1) According to the Harvard Bureau of Research this saving amounts to 11.3 per cent.
 - 2. Operating costs were reduced.
 - a. The American people are saved 12.3 per cent of the operating cost of the independent store because of the chain store.
 - b. At the same time chain store profits are 2.3 per cent, as against 1.8 per cent for the independent.
 - c. Chain stores eliminate credit and delivery.
 - (1) In the case of the independent store this amounts to about 3.2 per cent annually.
- II. By the application of these principles chain stores have directly benefited the American people.
 - A. They have given us lower prices on commodities.
 - 1. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the *Wall Street Journal*, estimates the saving on the average annual expenditure for the average size family in the United States to be 20.22 per cent.
 - a. This is not on a few leaders but on the great body of basic food commodities the American people have to buy.
 - 2. Other investigations and experiments estimate savings of 15 per cent, about one-fourth, or about one-fifth.
 - B. Because of lower prices, the chain stores have raised the standard of living.
 - 1. They have increased the purchasing power of the American dollar.
 - 2. Money saved from the grocer has made possible the wide-spread use of automobiles, radios, automatic household appliances, and other erstwhile luxuries.

- C. The chain store has given us an up-to-date progressive class of business men.
 - 1. Part of the training chain store managers receive, in the Penney and other companies, is in cooperating in community enterprises.
- D. The chain store is not driving the independent out of the field.
 - 1. According to *World's Work* "as long as the high class independent appeals to families of larger income who want credit, there is no need to fear a monopoly."
 - 2. It is only the inefficient independent who is being driven out.
 - a. The ratio of business failures has not increased during the last ten years.
- E. It is not true that the chain store is destroying the credit of the local community.
 - 1. Chain stores are leaving more money in the community than the independent store.
 - a. They send out less in purchases and keep more at home for profit than the independent.
 - 2. An investigation in one mid-western state showed that the chain stores keep money enough in the local banks to cover expenses.

THE CHAIN STORE SYSTEM

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

versus

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

CHAIRMAN

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—It seemed desirable to have some physical acrobatics before we began the mental process, so we showed you how we could elevate tables, and things of that sort, which necessitated a minute or two of delay. The speakers are here all right.

I have already informed the speakers, and one or two other groups, and now call to your attention a short, very informal reception for the speakers just after the debate. I should like to have the members of the School of Speech faculty who are here, present; and the members of Delta Sigma Rho who are here, present. We also want our critic of the debate to be present.

We are, of course, glad to welcome our neighboring state, in this particular capacity.

The chairman of such a performance as this has nothing to do but announce the proposition to be discussed and those who will discuss it. The proposition is: "Resolved, That the principle of the chain store system is detrimental to the best interests of the United States public."

Mr. W. Joseph Arnold, of Northwestern, will open for the Affirmative.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

W. Joseph Arnold, Northwestern

MR. CHAIRMAN, HONORABLE JUDGE, MOST WORTHY OPPONENTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :

It is often the difficulty of the first speaker for the Affirmative in a debate to interest the audience in the subject for discussion. I believe we are mutually fortunate, this evening, in having a subject of general intrinsic interest. As a matter of fact, one of our Senators, who may be one of the "Sons of Wild Jackasses" we have been hearing so much about lately, has said that the principal issue in the next presidential campaign will not be the tariff, will not be disarmament, nor any of the other major problems facing the country for so long, but will be some phase of the chain store question.

Now, it is almost impossible to determine the exact time of the inception of any large movement, but we can say definitely that the chain store had its inception in the year 1859 with the organization of the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company.

Others followed in rapid succession: Woolworth and Company in 1879; Kroger Grocery and Baking Company in 1882; National Tea Company in 1899; and others down to our present day. Of course, the vast majority of recent organizations are mergers of existing companies.

While the large companies of today had their inception prior to 1921, they were not of particular importance in the retailing field, for in 1921 they accounted for only 2 per cent of the retail business done in the United States. However, in 1928 these same organizations, many of them merged, did 19 per cent of this business. In addition, we are informed from a report on chain store sales that during the first six months of 1929 an increase of 21 per cent was shown over 1928 sales.

Thus we see that the period of chain store development which we are interested in this evening confines itself to those years from 1921 down to the present.

What, then, is this chain store system and what is the principle which underlies it? The definition given in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is as follows: "A chain store system consists of a number of unit retail stores operating under a common ownership and management, and following common policies and

utilizing common methods which are determined by central management."

Thus we see that the principle of the chain store involves two essential elements. (1) Unit or centralized management; (2) Concentrated ownership with a resulting concentration of profits. Both are integral and necessary parts of the system, for concentrated ownership furnishes the incentive for the enterprise, and centralized management the method of obtaining this desired end.

It seems hardly necessary to state, then, that the system which the Negative must of necessity defend this evening does not include any of the numerous and varied forms of organization that the independent dealers have evolved for collective buying, advertising, or any other purpose which does not include centralized ownership. As a matter of fact, these independent cooperative organizations are bound together almost without exception to combat the chain store.

There is another question that arises: that of the meaning of the term "detrimental to the best interests of the people of the United States." By detrimental we do not mean that the system is of necessity immediately harmful in all of its aspects, nor is it totally harmful, but we do mean that the chain store in working out its essential principle will redound, on the whole, to the injury of the American people in the long run.

Thus we see in the light of the history and full significance of the term "principle of the chain store," the question restates itself somewhat in this fashion: Whether the general trend in the field of retailing toward concentration of management, ownership and profits as exemplified by the chain store system in working out its essential principles will prove injurious to the people of this country.

Because this is the real proposition, it is not necessary for us to prove that the chain store system is vicious and dangerous in all of its aspects. If we of the Affirmative show that in working out its essential principle it redounds on the whole to the injury of the American people we shall have carried our share of the burden of proof in this debate.

We will go so far as to grant that the chain store does in some instances lower prices on some commodities; that it does in some instances force incompetent dealers out of business, but we shall contend that, altho the chain store has these advantages, they do not preponderate over the evils of the system.

With these remarks in mind, you can see that the question resolves itself into three issues: (1) Is the application of the principle of the chain store by its very nature a dangerous trend in the field of distribution? (2) Is the application of the principle of the chain store economically detrimental? (3) Is it socially detrimental?

It shall be my object as first speaker of the Affirmative to show that the application of the principle of the chain store, by its very nature, is a dangerous trend in the field of retailing because it represents a dangerous concentration in retail ownership.

There are at the present time about 3,700 chain store systems owning about 100,000 units.

Those of you who are a little older than the average college student will have no difficulty in recalling the great agitation and anxiety over the monopolistic and domineering tendencies of the railroads a few years ago. We all know the measures that were required to curb these evils. However, would it surprise you to know that the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company today is doing more business in dollars and cents than the Pennsylvania Railroad, which incidentally is the largest railroad in the world?

William J. Baxter, Director of Research for the Research Bureau of Chain Stores, an employe of banded chain stores, in discussing the growth of chain stores has stated, "In 1928 the sales have been slightly in excess of eight billion dollars. At the start of 1929 we had 101,000 stores in this country; chain stores which did as much business as 300,000 individual stores. In other words, already in this process the chain stores have displaced 300,000 independent merchants who we all through our history have been led to assume are the backbone of our nation and our democracy.

Prof. J. L. Palmer of the University of Chicago, whom our opponents will no doubt quote, in discussing this same topic makes this statement, "Although there are 800 grocery chains in this country with an estimated sales volume of three billions, 34 chains in 1927 had a volume of 45 per cent of this total. In 1928, 5 grocery chains had an aggregate of over one and one-quarter billions." In other words one-half of 1 per cent of the grocery chains in this country control almost 50 per cent of the chain store grocery business. Isn't that concentration of ownership? This leads us to the very heart of this debate—concentration, mergers, quasi-monopoly.

We present as our fundamental contention that the principle of the chain store system is detrimental to the best interests of the United States public because, by its very nature, it is monopolistic in tendency to a dangerous degree. Its very efficiency, which the gentlemen of the opposition will praise, makes it all the more dangerous in this tendency toward quasi-monopoly.

When principles of efficient management are applied in organized independent retailing you have this efficiency to the end that each individual is strengthened, but in the chain store this same efficiency is bent entirely in the direction of concentrated ownership, and if we seem to have momentary benefits it is only a temporary bi-product of its ultimate result.

But, you ask, how is this quasi-monopoly to be accomplished? The chain stores are employing four methods and coordinating them to the ends we have outlined.

First, we are all aware that production is keyed to a very high pitch in this country. This has brought in its wake keen competition for markets. Huge capital expenditures have been made to meet this high production rate and if markets decline these assets must still be kept in operation if there is to be any hope of profit. The chain stores realize this together with the fact that they control an ever-increasing portion of this market. As purchasers, then, they go into the market with surefire purchasing power and cause these producers to manufacture private and unknown brands at a price below the standard sales price of the balance of commodities being sold in order to sustain the point of production necessary to keep their properties in operation. It is obvious, then, that the standard brands must be sold at higher prices in order for these organizations to realize a profit on their operations.

In the second place, there is an increased tendency on the part of chain stores to do their own manufacturing. As an example, quoting from a booklet published by the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company, "Almost 500,000,000 crisp and tasty loaves of Grandmother's Bread come from our ovens every year. An average of 153,717 loaves are sold every hour of the business day across Atlantic and Pacific counters, not to say anything about the thousands of pounds of family flour that are sold in bulk." Here is a huge business itself which controls the production and sale in every phase of a basic necessity of life with the exception of the raising of the wheat, which we understand, from the action Congress has found necessary to take, to be the only unprofitable

portion of the process. Bear in mind also that this business of baking bread, which is an industry in itself, is only a very small part of the whole to which it contributes—the chain store.

Thirdly, mergers are an established part of the process of concentration of ownership. Many of the large companies of the present are mergers or purchases of many small companies, all of which tend to combat competition within the chain store field itself. And the period of mergers is not past; as a matter of fact it only appears to be beginning its real significance, for we have read within the last few days of a merger of Sears Roebuck and Company and the J. C. Penney Company which is about to be consummated. It is indeed significant to note that this is not the case of a weak struggling company being "bought out" by a stronger competitor. No, as a matter of fact, Sears Roebuck and Company is the largest mail-order business in the world as is the J. C. Penney Company the largest retail dry goods merchant. Both of these companies are strong but they are finding competition between themselves in the small town and in rural communities difficult; therefore, they pool their resources and effectually regulate this difficulty.

We now come to the fourth and probably the most insidious and effective method of the destruction of competition to which the chain store resorts—price-cutting. Its method is very simple. We have outlined the fact that chain stores purchase private and unknown brands at prices below that of standard brands which the independent must of necessity sell. Of course, the chain stores must sell standard brands also and they do at cut-throat, profitless prices. However, they must make a profit, and they do this also by selling the unknown brand at full or very often excessive prices. This combination, my friends, is the most effectual method of price-cutting and unfair competition that is known and it is a standard policy of the chain store. Lest my friends of the Negative doubt this indictment let me refer again to Mr. W. J. Baxter who, let me remind you, is an employe of combined chain stores. He makes this damaging statement, "To me there isn't any question as to the advisability of any retail stores selling some nationally known product at cost to get the crowd. . . . Scientific retailing means studying the blind articles and selling them at full prices. But what we call the open articles, the ones that the consumer can go from store to store and compare, selling them at low prices."

This is what the chain stores call "scientific retailing." It is nothing more than common, ordinary, moderated price-cutting, a natural characteristic of this giant octopus of retailing.

Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court, in speaking of price-cutting, not necessarily as reflected only in the chain stores but of the practice in general, has said, "Americans should be under no illusion as to the value and effect of price-cutting. It has been the most potent weapon of monopoly and means of killing the small rivals to which the trust has resorted most frequently. It is so simple, so effective."

Lest we think that this problem is local and of small significance it is interesting to note that it has found its way into the Congress of the United States. Representative Kelly of Pennsylvania, in speaking before the House on chain store price-cutting, said, "I do not protest against his [the small retailer's] destruction by practical methods, but no combination should have the right to bankrupt him through deceptive, dishonest business practices."

Thus you see that, on the basis of these facts and competent authorities, the principle of the chain store, by its very nature, represents a dangerous trend toward quasi-monopoly with its attending evils.

In short, by applying principles of efficiency with the ulterior motive of concentrated ownership as its goal, the chain store is detrimental to the people of the United States.

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—Mr. Howard Schumacher opening for the Negative.

FIRST NEGATIVE

Howard Schumacher, Iowa

MR. JUDGE, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The gentleman who has just left the floor has apparently committed himself to one fallacy which it seems necessary to dispose of at this time. He has said that he agrees that mass buying, or words to that effect, the buying economies which the chain stores have, are a good thing; and in the next instant he says that monopoly tending to follow out centralized control is bad.

We realize at once that mass buying, or, in other words, the efficiencies that can be effected through mass buying and through

centralized control, go hand in hand, and consequently are inseparable.

He has said that the chain stores, selling in one hundred and one thousand stores and doing a business of three hundred thousand stores, have necessarily driven out three hundred thousand independent stores.

This is not so, since we realize that each chain store unit, according to Professor Nystrom, whom they will quote during the course of the evening, does twice the business per unit that the independent stores do, and consequently although one hundred thousand stores have done the business of the three hundred thousand stores, yet they have displaced the small, inefficient stores who have not been amalgamated together and could not stand the pressure of real, honest-to-goodness competition.

Then they have said the chain stores are displacing the manufacturers, going into the manufacturing field themselves, which is, we admit, true in some instances. On the other hand, they have said this is evil; that it will work evil for the American people.

We must point out as one of the outstanding exceptions to this rule today, Henry Ford, for instance, who has centralized his entire manufacturing on the basis of standardization; who owns and operates every phase that deals in any broad way with his own industry, and consequently has offered what to the American people? A low priced car, within the reach of all, which is certainly not a detriment, although some people might be inclined to think that, but which really has furnished transportation to the American public, and consequently has shown the working, as it really is, of centralized control, the thing which they have said is harmful in the long run.

On the other phase of the chain store, we might point out one further example, and that is the Standard Oil Company, operating entirely upon a chain store basis, and they might bring up the fact that the Standard Oil Company was charged with monopoly some years ago. Even if that is true, and even if it was broken up into various units, they were allowed to work and operate in their own way, and consequently to give gasoline for Henry Ford's automobile at a lower cost, and thus pass on the savings in both lines, to the American people.

They have said it is to the disadvantage of the American manufacturer to have to sell to the chain store, on the basis of

the fact that he turns out unnamed brands or in other ways harms his own business. Dr. Palmer, of the University of Chicago, whom they have just quoted a moment ago, says it is to the advantage of the manufacturer to sell to the chains, because they have lower distribution costs and better methods, and can thus sell more of his products at lower prices.

If we are to consider the chain stores as such a particular evil, or leading to such a particular evil to the American people, then we must realize that the American people are being duped, you, each one in this audience, and I, every one is being duped by the chain stores, or they are just taking advantage of this innovation in business that has come to America and is here to stay.

The gentleman who just left the floor has very adequately introduced the subject of this evening; he has covered it fully and outlined the issues as they stand, and so it is my purpose to introduce the first phase of the negative side.

We proceed on the assumption that the chain stores are not a detriment to the American people, and naturally the logical assumption on our part is that they are a decided benefit. We shall show, in the course of the discussion this evening, that the chain stores are effecting a very great good for the American people as a whole, and for one class in particular.

According to *Printers' Ink*, 1928, the wage earners class constitutes 65 per cent of American population; and according to the *Magazine of Business* for September, 1928, 50 per cent of the American people and 30 per cent of the wealth was never touched by the chain stores; and consequently we may say that the 18 per cent of the business or eight billions of dollars of business which the chain stores are doing, is coming almost entirely from the 65 per cent of the American people who constitute the working class.

To follow this out further, we, the Negative, feel the combination of chain stores has something very definite to offer to this class of people. It will be my purpose to show that the chain stores, founded upon sound economic principles, today are benefiting the industries themselves through efficient marketing.

First, the need for the application of the chain store principle existed.

Second, the chain stores adopted the logical and necessary measures to fit this need.

Third, the measures have proven sound economically in their functioning.

We have only to review the period the affirmative speaker has outlined to us, and to mention the fact that directly after the war came the chain store expansion. Even so, during the war the manufacturers had been turning out a big production, and with the close of the war and no outlet for that production, it meant the factories either had to close or find a new outlet and market for it through distribution channels. In other words, there was no outlet available immediately following the war, unemployment followed, two and a half million thrown out of work, pay checks stopped, and the panic of 1921 and 1922, with which most are familiar, ensued. At that time the chain stores adopted the logical and necessary methods that were imperative at this time to relieve the nation in the crisis it was facing.

According to C. W. Staffler of *World's Work*:

"Yesterday was the day of mass production. Today the problem is no longer how to produce, but how to market efficiently what can be produced."

So the chain stores inaugurated the principle of centralized control, working through the principle of mass buying and necessarily leading to mass distribution.

The chain stores, in inaugurating centralized control, found this was the only method by which they could secure the efficiency in operation that Henry Ford and other great and successful men in America had found workable, and consequently it was found necessary that they have men of ability and capacity at the head of their organizations, who, with vision and foresight, could work out an organization such as they hoped to establish. Consequently, by establishing mass buying they could facilitate the movement from the manufacturer to the consumer.

It has been said that prior to the inauguration of chain stores, one-third of every American dollar spent was spent for distribution. In other words, it cost exactly thirty-five cents at the factory to produce what you, the American people, paid one dollar for.

Naturally Herbert Hoover, when he suggested eight billion dollars was wasted annually in distribution, was striking at this great evil of the American people, and was attempting to bring about measures that would eliminate it.

Mass distribution naturally followed, under the lead of centralized control and established numerous outlets in order to reduce, first, the burden of overhead costs of operation; and, secondly, to increase the volume, thereby establishing greater possibilities for mass buying, and thus effecting economies all along the line.

Now to see how these principles have worked out, we will have a short resume of their application to America, and the results they have brought about. In the first place, centralized control has been an inexpensive proposition for the American people. The A. and P. for instance, can pay thirty thousand dollars a year for their executives, and if there are ten thousand stores, it means only three dollars per store per year. Furnishing, as we say, tremendous executive ability and efficiency, and thus furnishing the buying power that necessarily effects savings all along the line and thus enables them to furnish to the 65 per cent of our population, the American wage earners, the savings they do furnish.

Secondly, the efficiencies are very great through buying in large quantities. According to the Harvard Bureau of Research, such buying enables the chain stores to buy for 88.7 cents what the independent dealer would pay one dollar for. This saving of 11.3 cents is a very remarkable one, in buying efficiency.

Now as to efficiency in distribution. According to Monroe and Stratton, *Buying in our Markets*, and the Harvard Bureau of Research, both quoting the same figures that I have, the wholesalers and independents respectively figure their costs of operation and profits, totals, eliminating the profit of the independent, 27.3 per cent of the selling price; 17.3 per cent operating cost for the independent, and 10 per cent operating cost and profit for the jobber or wholesaler. Thus we find it is costing 27.3 per cent for the independent merchant to get his material to him and ready to sell, without considering his profits, which amount to 1.8 per cent according to the same authorities.

On the other hand, Paul H. Nystrom of Columbia University says that chain store operation, including the cost of maintaining the headquarters, warehouse facilities and unit stores, is 15 per cent of their selling price. Thus we see automatically that we have effected a saving of 12.3 per cent on the operating cost of the independent store versus the chain store in their actual functioning.

And to compare the actual profit made by each organization, we see the independent making a profit of 1.8 per cent and the chain store a profit of 2.3 per cent. So the difference in the actual standardizing there effects to the American people a net saving of 12 per cent, which is a remarkable fact when we consider this passes to the American people from a business of eight billion dollars per year.

Each member of this audience possibly caters to a chain store in some way or another, or possibly never sees the inside of them, but the fact remains they have their following, and they are patronized by 65 per cent of the population, or the wage earners class.

Consequently, the chain stores are founded upon sound economic principles of mass buying and distribution, all under centralized control. We have shown that mass buying is of great importance to the extent of 11.3 per cent saving to the chain; that the mass distribution saves another 12.3 per cent; and then we have not considered the fact that they eliminate credit and delivery, which in the case of the independent store comes to about 3.2 per cent annually.

Consequently we can see without question that the chain stores are effecting great savings to the American people and therefore are not detrimental, but are working a real benefit to the American public.

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—William Wines will continue for the Affirmative.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

William Wines, Northwestern

MR. JUDGE, MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Let me at the outset concede everything that the Negative has said this evening with respect to the benefits of mass buying. Let me concede everything that the Negative has said this evening with respect to the benefits of an efficient and capable and competent management; and let me concede also that to a very large extent the chain store has provided both of those factors in our economic and retailing fields.

But let me, at this time, point out to you very clearly that mass buying and efficient management are not necessarily the

principle of the chain store system, which is the question for debate this evening. Rather, they are attributes of that system.

The principle of the chain store system is that thing, whatever it is, that differentiates it from everything else in the universe. It is the differential that is the thing which makes it a chain store.

Ladies and Gentlemen, that principle is not mass buying by any manner of means, because mass buying occurs in a great many other fields, as I shall shortly show. No. The thing that differentiates the chain store from every other form of retailing is centralized control and concentrated ownership. That is the principle of the chain store.

Ladies and Gentlemen, our opponents have chosen to compare the chain store with the Standard Oil Company, and there are people in this audience who can easily remember the battle that the United States had against the Standard Oil Company some years ago; yet the Negative, who are supposed to be defending the chain stores, compare the chain stores to the chief cause of anti-trust legislation and prosecution.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, they have also been guilty of the fallacy of reasoning in a circle. They have argued that the American public goes to the chain store because the chain store is good, and that the chain is good because the American public goes there. A perfect illustration of circular reasoning.

Resuming, now, the constructive case of the Affirmative, and reserving such other points for rebuttal until they fit in with the development of my speech, I shall base the second portion of my speech, namely, that the chain store is detrimental to the best interests of the United States, economically, upon three major reasons.

In the first place, the chain store is detrimental to the best interests of the United States public in the field of economics, because it is threatening the independent merchant, the individualist in our business world.

And, remember, when you threaten the independent merchant, you not only threaten him, you threaten all of his clerks, you threaten his family, you threaten every employe, you threaten his wholesaler and you threaten everyone who is economically dependent upon him, his lawyer, his doctor, and his child's music teacher. Therefore, anything which touches the independent merchant presents a very grave menace to the distribution of wealth in this country.

Is the independent merchant worthy of protection? Let me quote to you Emanuel Celler, Representative in the United States Congress from the State of New York, who says:

"I think that the independent merchant is worthy of aid. I hold no brief for the incompetent, for the shiftless, the lazy independent merchant—the sooner the shroud of oblivion envelops him the better. I speak of the honest, competent, independent merchant. What of his future? He cannot compete with any degree of equality with the chain stores in New York City, no matter how capable, efficient, ambitious and honest he may be."

Those words come from a member of the United States Congress in his address on chain stores published in the consensus by the National Economic League.

The chain store is fighting the independent by price-cutting and by unfair competition. But let me here point out, and this I want you to remember if you do not remember anything else I may say during this debate,—that unless the chain store system is the best possible system, or unless it does not interfere with the best possible system, then it is a detriment to the best interests of the United States public.

For instance, if a young boy is able to put himself through some sort of college education and his father can give him a somewhat better college education, at first blush it would appear that his father was a benefit to him; but if his father by forcing him to accept this somewhat better education prevents him from accepting a superior education offered by his uncle or by some friend, then his father is a detriment to him; and we contend that is precisely what the chain store is doing, and in this respect the chain store is fighting the one system which possesses both the advantages of independent, individual merchanting and concentrated mass buying, namely, such organizations as the Independent Grocers' Association, such organizations as have the power of mass buying, and yet do not have the very dangerous element of centralized control.

So if that system possesses the advantages of both the chain store system and the independent merchanting system, then every cent that the chain store takes from that system is a positive economic detriment.

The chain store is also presenting a dangerous trend in our field of credit. It is taking the money earned in small rural and in all semi-urban communities, it is taking the money which normally belongs there, which is needed there, and it is send-

ing it not to all the cities, but to only a few, cities such as New York and in some cases Boston, and occasionally some other large cities such as Chicago.

Now, by taking that money out of the rural communities it is concentrating wealth; it is concentrating what ought to be fluid, in the hands of a few, and the dangerous consequences of that trend will be pointed out by our third speaker, as far as their social implications are concerned; but even economically it presents this very dangerous threat to our economic existence, because the chain store movement, with its flow of money, possesses every element of a quasi-monopoly in the making.

What are the elements of a monopoly? Compare them with the Standard Oil Company, since that is what the Negative has asked you to compare the chain store with.

First, centralized control of production. The chain stores have it, and so does the Illinois Grocers' Association.

Second, centralized control of immediate or wholesale distribution.

Third, centralized control of ultimate or consumer distribution.

Those three are not particularly dangerous, if it stops there; but fourth, and most important of all, centralized control of the distribution of profits.

Those, I say, are the four principles of the monopolistic tendency. Compare any quasi-monopoly in the history of the United States and you will find it is founded upon those four basic principles, and you will find every one of those principles in the chain store as it exists today.

You will find that the chain store also has the practices of a monopoly in the making. Lower prices? Yes, upon some articles at certain times. In fact, Ladies and Gentlemen, every one in this audience can remember that it was only a few years ago when the Atlantic and Pacific Tea store was giving away bread in an effort to put the independent merchant out of business.

You know perfectly well that the giving away of bread by the chain store was not done from any altruistic or charitable purpose. It is very true that for a while we profit, but such a saving as that is an unhealthy saving, it is an abnormal and an unnatural saving, and you know just as well as I do what it points to.

Now, on the question of price-cutting let me quote to you Mr. Justice Holmes, who is recognized everywhere as a most liberal and progressive man, and yet, liberal as he is, broad as is his vision, he has this to say about price cutting in the Dr. Miles Medical Company case:

"I cannot believe that in the long run, the public will profit by this court permitting knaves to cut reasonable prices for some ulterior purpose of their own, and thus impair, if not destroy, the production and sale of the articles which it is assumed to be desirable that the public should get."

Mr. Justice Brandeis, who has already been quoted, also says:

"The process of exterminating the small, independent retailer, already hard pressed by capitalistic combinations of existing mail order houses, existing chain stores, already the displacement of the small independent business man by the huge corporation, with its myriads of employes, its absentee ownership, and its financial control, presents a grave danger to our democracy. The social loss is great, and there is no economic gain."

This from the two most progressive judges upon the Supreme Court bench of the United States.

But even supposing, for the sake of the argument, that the chain store fails in its attempt to achieve a quasi-monopoly, and we hope it will, yet the very means that it is employing to attain that end are themselves detrimental to the best economic interests of the United States public, for they consist, as we have shown, in price-cutting, and in driving the independent and those who depend upon him out of business.

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—Mr. Webber, for the Negative, will continue the argument.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Fred Webber, Iowa

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The gentlemen of the opposition this evening have been a little bit inconsistent. They have told us, in fact they have condemned us for talking about a principle being anything which can be in anything else. They say a principle is that which differentiates from

everything else, and yet they talk about the principle of the chain store being an unfair method of competition.

Now, it does not stand to reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, that all the business men in the United States are engaged in the chain store business. I have known a few, one or two, in the independent retailing business.

According to their definition of a principle, that cannot be a principle, and therefore not under the scope of the question this evening.

But let us consider, a little more fully, what a principle is. The Affirmative has said that it is that which differentiates, in this case the chain store, from any other form of retailing; and they have said we are out of our field when we are talking about mass buying and mass distribution, because that does not differentiate the chain from anything else.

Funk and Wagnall's *Standard Dictionary* defines a principle as that which is inherent in anything determining its nature. Now, it might be inherent in my nature that I should love a certain thing, a certain type of music, or something of that kind, and at the same time it might be inherent in someone else's nature that they should love the same type of music. The fact that a thing is inherent in a chain store does not mean that it cannot be inherent in something else.

Therefore, we believe that we are entirely within our rights in discussing the question of mass buying and mass distribution, and showing that those are beneficial to the American people, and also centralized control.

The second speaker of the opposition has dealt with the alleged fact that the chain stores are threatening the existence of the independent merchant and therefore being a detriment to the United States. But, he went right on to quote some Senator from New York, or Representative, which is worse, to the effect that he held no brief for the inefficient, incompetent retail merchant. That is just the point, Ladies and Gentlemen. We do not either.

Dr. Julius Kline, Assistant Secretary of Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce, says this:

"A recent survey by a nationally known credit rating firm shows that competition accounted for 3.6 per cent of business failures in 1928, and 31.4 per cent are charged up under the

heading of incompetence, and 35 per cent under the heading of lack of capital."

If the independents are going out of business, it is their own fault. The chains are not driving anybody out but the inefficient and the incompetent.

Now, the Affirmative have quoted Professor Palmer of the University of Chicago this evening. On this point we are willing to quote Professor Palmer also, for he says this:

"As I see it, the only economic justification for any commercial enterprise is its ability to meet competition."

If the independent retailer has some service to render to the American people, and we believe he has, and if he can meet competition by competence, by efficiency, by being up to date, well and good. If he cannot, then we are benefiting and not being a detriment to the American people if we push him out of the way.

Another authority on this is Bradstreet's commercial report for 1928, which says: "Lack of capital and inefficiency are the causes underlying nearly all failures."

We believe, then, we have shown that the chain stores are not responsible for driving out the independent merchant.

Now, the Affirmative have also spoken about certain evils in the chain store organization, and they have talked about these as though they are principles of the chain store. No, they are not principles. They are manifestations of a principle. They are ways in which the chain store has developed.

Every worthwhile organization goes through certain changes which it later discards. We believe if we can show you one example of a chain store which does not use unfair methods of competition, and which, in spite of its failure to use those unfair methods has succeeded as a chain store organization, then we shall have shown that that is not inherent in the chain store system, and therefore not a principle and not to be considered in the question this evening.

For our example in this case we cite the Melville Shoe Company. Back in 1923 the McElwaine Shoe Manufacturing Company was bankrupt. Instead of giving the business up they entered into an agreement with the Melville Shoe Company to produce a certain number of shoes, to sell them without profit to the Melville Shoe Company, and this Melville Shoe Company

in turn sold them at a standard price of four dollars per pair. Now, that is not unfair; that is not an unreasonably low price for a pair of shoes for the type of people the chain store serves, and the profits the Melville Shoe Company got were divided with the manufacturer to make up for the fact that they sold without profit.

What is the result? Last year the McElwaine Shoe Manufacturing Company paid a dividend of three hundred thousand dollars, after being bankrupt in 1923. The Melville Shoe Company has succeeded in spite of the fact that it has not used unfair methods of competition, either with the manufacturer, with the independent merchant, or with the public. Therefore, we believe that this is not inherent in chain store organization, therefore not a principle, and not to be considered this evening.

Mr. Schumacher pointed out in our first speech that the chain stores are founded upon sound economic principles. In continuation of that I wish to point out that by the application of those principles they have directly benefited the American people.

First, they have given us lower prices on commodities, and not on just a few commodities as the gentlemen of the Affirmative would maintain, but on the great body of the material that the chain stores sell.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, as quoted in the *Wall Street Journal*, states that the average annual expenditure for the average size family in the United States for a certain number of basic food commodities at the independent store would be \$301.30, while at a chain store it would be \$250.62; a saving of \$50.68; or, to get it in percentage, 20.22 per cent. That is not on just a few leaders; that is on the great body of basic food commodities that the American people have to buy.

Let us quote also Monroe and Stratton, of Columbia University, who conducted three investigations of the chain and independent stores in New York, and various places around there, finding in one case a saving of 15 per cent by buying at the chain store. A second experiment was with a housekeeping group, starting out with an empty kitchen, stocking it for a week from chain stores, and then re-emptying it and starting over and stocking for a week from independent stores. The result was \$17.30 for the week for the chain store; and \$21.49 for the independent, or a saving of about one-fourth.

A third experiment was a similar one, but in a different section of the country, some time later, and with a smaller family, and the figures were: \$14.81 for the chain store and \$18.20 for the independent store, a saving of \$3.39, or approximately one-fifth.

This is where groups have bought all their stuff at a chain store. They have taken all of their prices and not just a few leaders, as the Affirmative point out, and yet they have found lower prices.

Now, secondly, because of these lower prices the chain stores have increased the purchasing power of the American dollar, and have therefore raised the general standard of living. Installment buying, which has made possible the widespread ownership of automobiles, radios, automatic household appliances and things of that nature, has been possible, Ladies and Gentlemen, only because the American public has been freed from the bondage of the grocer. As long as you pay out everything you earn for groceries and clothing, you cannot buy anything that is going to raise your standard of living.

E. T. Konsberg and Company of Chicago have said, "The curve showing the rise of home construction in the United States almost coincides with the curve of the chain store food consumption in the United States."

While we would not assert a strict relation between the two, certainly we are justified in saying the Affirmative must be wrong in stating the chain store system deludes the people into paying higher prices instead of lower, when these things are increasing at the same time that food consumption is increasing.

And, finally, the chain store has benefited the American people through giving us an up-to-date progressive class of business men, which would not be possible under the system of independent stores alone.

The J. C. Penney Company make it a direct part of their training for chain store managers that they shall be taught to cooperate in community enterprises. In the State of Iowa, out of fifty-seven chain store companies, forty are allowed to contribute to community enterprises, with the amount not set by their central office. They are allowed to make that contribution without any reference to the central office at all.

The Melville Shoe Company, again may we cite them as another example in this case. It is a part of their training for chain store managers that they be able to cooperate in com-

munity affairs, and may we point out it is only reasonable to believe they are interested in community affairs when you know the wide growth they have experienced during the last few years. If they were not wide awake to the community interests, they certainly would not increase their distribution in the communities where they are located.

Now, because the chain stores have lowered the prices, not on just a few leaders, but on the great mass of commodities which they handle, and because of these lower prices they have increased the purchasing power of the American people and therefore raised their standard of living, and because they have given us a class of progressive, up-to-date business men, we of the Negative believe that chain stores have been a positive benefit and not any detriment to the American people.

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—Jerome L. Fels will close the constructive argument for the Affirmative. Mr. Fels.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Jerome L. Fels, Northwestern

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The gentlemen of the Negative asked us two questions in relation to the size of the chain store: first, why do people go to them? and, second, is not their size an indication of great worth?

The circular nature of that reasoning has been pointed out by my last colleague. But, I might say in relation to prices and price-cutting, as we have explained it, Mr. Foster, one of the editors of the *New York American*, said in the *Nation's Business* for July: "Intelligent women know they make up in one article what they save in another, and it is high time consumers be told that bargains are not always what they seem."

Now, we feel that the chain, by price-cutting, is gaining in size; we feel that it must gain in size. The gentlemen of the Negative have told you that price-cutting is not an inherent characteristic of the chain. We do not think it is an inherent principle, but it is something they must use in order to effect the concentration of ownership and great size.

They claim the chain sells cheaper. The only reason they can make the 24.2 per cent profit they do make by selling cheaper,

is by tremendously increasing their turnover. They cannot increase that turnover without extending their market. To extend their market they have got to push somebody out, and that is why they use price-cutting, which Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court of the United States has told us is one of the simplest and most effective means of gaining the huge market that usually means monopoly or quasi-monopoly. In getting that market by price-cutting, they are not only detrimental to the consumer, but to the producer.

President Tyler, of Tyler, Simpson and Company, one of the greatest advertising companies in America, says that:

"Advertised lines are driven out of the market by price-slashing of the chain stores."

Why is that so? The chain store cuts the price on a standard line like Campbell's soup, and the independent drops them. When the independent drops them, the chain store drops them. Why, I ask you, does the chain store drop them? They drop that article because they are merely cutting prices on that article as a leader in order to get people to come into their store to increase their sales.

Now, take the quasi-monopoly such as the Standard Oil Company which the Negative brought up. My colleagues have shown you that the chain is detrimental to the best interests of the United States economically, by its very nature, because of its centralized control of distribution, its mass buying and concentrated ownership. It is beating down the producer, and incidentally these gentlemen claim the producer is benefited by the chain. I want to tell you the most vicious attacks on the chain have come through the manufacturers, through their organ, the *Manufacturers Record*, because the chains buying in large quantities so much of their products, can dictate the prices.

If they do not get the prices they want, they stop buying, and the producer, when 30 or 40 or 50 per cent of his output is cut off like that, why, the producer as well as the advertiser is against the chain.

We are not trying to be dogmatic or belligerently positive. We admit that efficiency is a good thing and that mass buying can help to drop prices for us. I ask you to put that on one side of the scale. Do not brush them off, consider them as they have asked you to do; but put on the other side of the scale the way in which the chain store does use its mass buying, the way in

which it does cut prices, the way in which it does undermine the credit system, and the way it does harm the producer, and see if the balance does not fall in our favor.

We of the Affirmative feel you can brush all these economic principles off our side of the scale, and still our side would entirely outweigh theirs, because of the social implication that came about with the chain.

As you may have noticed, there are eleven state legislatures which have been trying to tax the chain stores out of existence. This has been confined to no political party. It comes from republican Vermont, from old guard republican Pennsylvania, from democratic Texas, and radical Wisconsin. X

These people feel the chain stores are socially detrimental and we think they are right. We believe these gentlemen on these legislatures are right, because the chain is detrimental to the best interests of the United States public, both from the standpoint of the individual and of the community. The chain takes an employer class and makes of them employees.

The Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company, which our opponents have mentioned so many times this evening, have seventeen thousand stores, have seventeen thousand units for doing business, and there would be under the I. G. A. we have mentioned seventeen thousand employers in charge of those units, but those seventeen thousand under the chain stores are employees, not employers.

Herbert Hoover has said that he thinks the entire basis of American prosperity is American individualism, which he characterizes as independent, individual capital tempered by social control.

In an article in the *Chicago Tribune* of last week it was well said that the independent man is the basis of our prosperity, and we must maintain his independent opportunity, but this is what the chain takes away, and in that way we believe it is certainly detrimental to the individual inasmuch as it makes of him an employe and takes away that initiative which has characterized free men and free nations of all time.

The chain is also socially detrimental. It works, as my colleague has suggested, on the system of putting nothing in and taking everything out. The chain money all goes to a few cities, Boston, New York and Chicago. What has that done to the

credit system of the manufacturers? Herbert Hoover in his last speech to Congress has said:

"One of the fundamentals of the American credit system, which is that credit which is based upon banking deposits, should be controlled by persons within those areas which furnish these deposits, and thus be subject to the restraints of local interests and public opinion in those areas."

In the *Manufacturers Record* for October 10, 1929, was an interview with President Haywood of the American Bankers Association, in which he said: "The amount of net balance which chain stores carry is not sufficiently large to affect the cost of handling accounts. To be perfectly frank, we have never yet found a chain store banking account on a profitable basis in a country bank," and he predicted that the chain stores absorbing a very large proportion of the wealth of the country would be disastrous to the national prosperity.

That was in October. Has this prediction been fulfilled? Our first great crisis since then is covered by an article in the financial section of one of our metropolitan papers, which reads:

"Distribution of credit unequal, bankers think. Adjustment necessary, is general opinion. There has been thus far no noticeable movement of funds to the interior. The problem which faces the banking authorities is that of stimulating a flow of funds from New York City so as to bring about a more even distribution of credit."

And then the article goes on to say that is the big problem facing the Federal Reserve Board today, the rehabilitation of credit that the chain, in taking the money away from the small communities, has just about wrecked. Thus we see that the chain gives us a condition where production is unstable and where credit is uncertain. Due to their price cutting and sending the money to the big cities, they put into those communities an individual who lacks the initiative of the old Anglo-American type, which is absolutely necessary to make up free men who make up a free nation. It makes of them a mechanized, routinized type of individual. It is an old truism and law of political science that money is power, and where money is there is political power, and thus the chain, concentrating wealth in a few hands, also concentrates political power in a few hands.

That theory was first brought to our attention by Harrington in 1857. Let us take the Bourbons of France, for instance; those who held the land held also the political power. The barons of England held the land and held political power. Take feudal and manor England, and more people had control of wealth and thus control of political power. Moreover, the Whigs were the commercial power in the land of aristocracy, and it is with the raising of their wealth, with their getting wealth through commerce, that they got political power.

Now, it is absolutely a law of political science that wealth is power, and once having proven, as I and my colleagues have done, that the chain operations are a concentration of wealth in a few hands, all the rest of what I have said simply follows, and it merely needs to be pointed out rather than proved, but we have a concentration of wealth in a few hands and places, which means there will be a tendency toward concentration of political power in those places.

We believe this is certainly detrimental to the best interests of the United States public, because it means there is no room in the same system for a chain and a democracy.

Perhaps the gentlemen of the Negative believe a democracy is not for the best interests of the United States public. We think it is. We of the Affirmative believe that democracy is still to the best interests of the United States public and we think the social order which can only exist under democracy is for the best interests of the United States public; and we think that inasmuch as the chain destroys that, it is detrimental in that sense to the best interests of the United States public.

Therefore, to come back to the subject, we see where the chain gives certain benefits of mass buying and lower prices on some articles, some of the time, that is really just touching the fringe of the question. The real crux of the question is this monopoly which the Negative failed to touch upon in the least, and we feel that this monopoly, this concentrated ownership and centralized control and distribution of profits, means the destruction of our democracy, and seeing that it is an inherent part of the chain system, the only differential of the chain system, therefore the chain, possessing that, is certainly detrimental to the best interests of the United States public.

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—Edward Carmody will close the constructive argument for the Negative.

THIRD NEGATIVE

Edward Carmody, Iowa

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: During the course of this discussion we of the Negative have laid down three fundamental principles which the chain store is based upon, namely, mass buying, mass distribution and centralized control. The American public have given their approval to mass buying, mass distribution and centralized control by patronizing the chain store, by giving the chain store their support.

We have placed our stand in this debate as not opposed to the independent store, as not driving out the independent store, but having the chain store and the independent store existing side by side in the community. That is the stand of the Negative in this debate.

During the course of the discussion we have shown in the first place that the principles of the chain store are based upon sound economic rules; that the chain store has developed through normal economic growth; and in the second place, as a result of this sound economic growth we have certain definite advantages given to you and me as individuals in the community, namely, we are given lower prices and as a result of that more money is being placed in our pocket books, and as a result we are also given a progressive type of business man that is an asset to the community, that is better in many respects than the inefficient independent organizations.

Looking now to the Affirmative's case this evening, we find them presenting three points. In the first place they state that the chain store is dangerous to the American public because of its concentrated distribution, because of its concentrated ownership. They state that the chain store is tending toward a horrible monopoly. Within a few years all we can expect is that that chain store will probably own all of the other chain stores and there will exist no independent stores in the community.

However, if we look to the analysis of this point we find, first, that the production today is keyed up to a high degree. That was the first point under their analysis.

We pointed out in our constructive material that because of the high keying up of production today we thought the chain store was a benefit to the community, because with all of this

excess material upon the manufacturer's hands, he had no way to get rid of it, and the chain store offered that method of distribution, and that method is efficient.

In the second place they stated the chain stores often own their own manufactories. That is true of practically every manufacturing business. Take for example the Ford Company. They have their own manufactories and they also distribute their own products. That is no reason to believe that Henry Ford will own all of the other types of automobiles, say, in twenty-five years.

And, in the third place they said that the chain store was using price-cutting methods and as a result of that we could only expect a monopoly. However, when they say that the chain store is using price-cutting methods, they apparently have not given consideration to the independent store. We ask them, is the independent store using price cutting methods today? If the independent store is using price-cutting methods today, certainly that would not tend to establish that the independents are going to have a monopoly. We ask them whether the independent store is using price cutting methods today. Many of you are familiar with the "dollar day" or "one cent sale" organized by the independent stores. All of those practices are what you might call price-cutting practices, and they are exercised by the independent store, and that is no reason why the chain store is going to be a monopoly. The chain stores today are governed by the same economic rules that the independent stores are governed by.

In the first place, we have the rule of diminishing returns. Within a certain area you can get so much production out of it, and beyond that you cannot get any more. There is so much buying power in that area, and if you put more chain stores in that area you are merely going to divide up the sales among the chain stores.

For example, the Woolworth Company in 1925 had 1,581 stores, and in 1927 they had 1,725 stores, or an increase of nearly two hundred stores, approximately 15 per cent. You would naturally think there would be an increase in sales of approximately 15 per cent, but the increase was only 5 and a fraction per cent, showing that within a given area you can only get so much out of it and no more.

According to the July report of the Federal Reserve Board of Chicago thirty chains were investigated, and through that investigation they found that the sales per unit decreased in the last six months, showing that the chain stores have expanded to their fullest degree in this area.

Furthermore, let us look at the quotation given by *World's Work* for September, 1929. "As long as the high class independent appeals to the families of larger income, who want credit, there is no need to fear that a monopoly will result."

The second contention presented by our friends from Northwestern was that the chain store was detrimental economically because it threatened the independent merchant. They did not state any advantages that the independent merchant today was giving the American public, as we, of the Negative, have shown the chain store is giving. They merely said the chain store was threatening the independent merchant.

Is the independent merchant justified in being kept in the retail field? The chain store today is not threatening the efficient independent merchant. For example, an investigation was made of the different classes of independents, and when we speak of an independent store we cannot say all independents are alike, because they are not alike. There are certain different classes of independent stores. For example, in an investigation made by the Federal Reserve Board in conjunction with the Senate Investigation, they found that 79,000 independent stores were interviewed, and of that 79,000 stores, 37,000 were doing an annual business under \$5,000 a year, or a percentage of 41 per cent; 14 per cent were doing a business of less than \$10,000 a year.

Just what does that mean in dollars and cents? It means that each one of these individual operators in the independent store had a weekly gross profit of eight dollars. Out of that eight dollars he had to supply his family with living expenses and also run his store. Those in the \$10,000 class received \$16 per week, and they had to provide their families with the necessities, and also provide for the operation of their stores. So we find that almost 35 per cent of the independent stores today are doing a business where they receive approximately \$16 per week or less. These types of individuals certainly are not giving the American public a benefit. They are the individuals who are going out of business; and it is not the chain store

competition that is pushing them out of business either, because we find that according to Dun and Bradstreet the ratio of failures in the last forty years has remained a constant.

Since the greatest growth in development of the chain stores has been in the last ten years, or since the World War, we could normally have expected that ratio of failures to increase. However, it has remained constant. Or, in other words, the chain stores are not driving these independents out of business, but their own inefficiency is driving them out, and irrespective of whether we want chain stores or not, those independent stores are going out of business because of their inefficiency.

Their third contention was that the chain stores are detrimental to the best interests of the community because of the social aspect, and they stated that they are destroying the great institution of credit in America. Under that point they quote the president of the American Bankers Association.

However, we should like to point out that in this same speech of this president of the American Bankers Association he also stated there was another side to the chain store question. He stated that an investigation was made in a mid-western state where they asked the bankers in that state whether the chain stores did have a sufficient amount on deposit in the bank to cover expenses, and 70 per cent of these independent banks stated that the chain stores did have a sufficient deposit in their banks.

Now, they stated it was destroying credit because money was going out of the community. However, let us analyze the facts and see whether money is actually going out of the community. If we look to the facts, we find that actually more money is being kept in the community, because if you take the dollar as a basis, the independent merchant sends out 80.9 per cent when he purchases an article, and keeps at home 1.8 per cent for his profit, and overhead of approximately 17.3 per cent.

The chain store, on the other hand, sends out when it buys goods, 69.6 per cent, and also sends out, supposedly, its profit of 2.3 per cent, making a total of 71.9 per cent, and an overhead of 7.5 per cent is kept within the community, and also that saving to the public is kept within the community, namely, 14 per cent, so we find the chain stores leaving more money in the community than the independent stores are doing.

During the course of this debate the Negative has presented three arguments. First, that the principles of the chain store today are based upon sound economic bases. Secondly, that as a result of the application of these principles the American people are given certain benefits; they are given lower prices and also more money is placed in their pockets. And thirdly, that the chain store today is injecting within the community a type of business man that is progressive and that is an asset to the American people.

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—Each of the three speakers on each side of the discussion has five minutes for rebuttal argument, and the speakers will proceed with that rebuttal in the order in which they have presented the constructive argument without further presentation to you by the chairman.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Howard Schumacher, Iowa

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My colleague has just cleared up a good many of the points which were up for discussion, leaving, it seems to me, only two points yet to be clarified.

The first of these is this: The affirmative speaker, No. 3, in presenting his case took about five minutes, I should judge, in telling you folks how the scales look and telling you folks why they lean one way or the other, without telling you anything except that the scale leans this way because it leans this way.

In the last seven minutes he had a very debatable point, which is this, that the concentrated profits of the chain stores presents one of the great evils to the American people. I should like to have him present some sort of figures to that effect. We have figures for 1923, showing that \$53,476,000 worth of stocks and bonds were issued by the chain store organizations, which, in other words, means that the American people themselves are collecting at least a portion of the profits of the chain stores. We have not bothered to quote the figures of 1926 or 1927, but quoting 1928, the latest available figures, we find the American people have bought \$241,297,000 worth of chain store stocks, and

we realize from the very best banking authorities that the chain stores represent a very safe investment today, because they pay off what they say they will pay, and so they are not accumulating their profits in the hands of a few men, but throughout the great American Republic, and to those of the great American public who can afford to buy stocks.

They have repeatedly referred to the cooperative organization in Illinois having the same centralized control. We should like to have it appear that the cooperative organization in every instance has some executive buyer who works under their command, and the command is usually in the hands of the organization itself, who vote as units. Furthermore, they must buy stock to participate in the farm cooperative, and consequently we have a board of directors and centralized control once again.

They brought up the fact that so many state legislatures have effected legislation here and there, but we might remind them that the United States Supreme Court is usually considered quite a wise body, and they have declared the measures passed by the state legislatures unconstitutional, and finally remind them that congressmen go to Congress only to pass things for their constituency, so consequently measures declared unconstitutional after being passed by the state legislatures have no bearing on the case.

Then again they have said that the manufacturers and producers are hurt by the chain store system. Let us again remind them that Dr. Palmer, whom they have quoted as a chain store authority, says that the manufacturers benefit by selling to the chain stores because they can move more goods at lower prices, and consequently keep their production at top speed, more checks going out, more people employed, and consequently prosperity all down the line of American industry, and the business world kept at its peak.

Furthermore, they have neglected to quote any examples of manufacturers who have been sorely pressed. Let us call to their attention the fact that the Mennen Company, the National Biscuit Company and the American Can Company have all carried cases to the courts, and on up to the United States Supreme Court, on the contention that they should be allowed to sell their materials at whatever prices they choose to quote to the chain stores, and in every instance this has been fostered by the independents; and the Mennen Company contended in its

case that they had the right to sell to two distinct types of buyers, the wholesaler and the retailer, and the court upheld them. Consequently, the manufacturers have a right to give the wholesale price to a retailer and so pass that saving on.

Therefore, it seems to me with those examples in the decisions that the manufacturers are yet with us.

Then they probably have forgotten that in every instance the independent has been the basis of the chain stores. The head of every chain store organization today has been a successful independent retailer who through his ability to operate successfully has gathered together one, two, three and up to fifteen or twenty units, and thus proven the principle of the chain store system to be of benefit to the American public today.

We have shown definitely that the chain stores are performing a function that is for the good of America, and we cannot in any wise depart from the fact that the three principles of mass buying, centralized control and concentrated ownership go hand in hand, since concentrated ownership only paves the way for the other two.

I thank you.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

W. Joseph Arnold, Northwestern

The first point of the argument I think I must clear up this evening is that of the principle of the chain store. They have quoted Funk and Wagnall's *Dictionary* and said that principle is an inherent characteristic. We say also that we again quote from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which says, "These inherent characteristics are, first, concentrated ownership, and, second, concentrated management."

The gentlemen of the Negative at no time in this debate have defined centralized ownership. They have merely said that in 1928, \$241,000,000 of stock of chain stores was purchased by the people of the United States. I wonder if you know that 90 per cent of the outstanding stock of corporations in the United States is held by 5 per cent of the people in this country. That under the old feudal regimes 15 per cent of the people controlled the balance of the people. This is exactly the thing we mean by centralized ownership. They advocate it.

They said that the independent merchant is the same as a chain store, because he has to buy stock in his corporation, and his corporation is in turn controlled by a board of directors. He pays a membership fee—I know because I happen to be working for a cooperative organization—he pays a membership fee in an organization which gives him the privilege of obtaining the benefits of this particular organization. However, he must finance his own enterprise, his own store. He does not obtain any outside help, unless from his banker. That is the difference between the chain store and the independent organization.

Now, it was said that the principle of the chain store is mass buying, mass distribution, and concentrated control, and then they have gone on to say that the points we have made have not tended to disestablish this mass buying.

In other words, the first speaker said—or rather, contended that I said, that mass buying is good for the independent but is bad for the chain store. I did not say that at all. What I did say was this, that mass buying in the independent store, with the ulterior motive of establishing the independent in a more secure and more firm place, is a good thing for the American public; but mass buying with the ulterior motive of concentrating ownership in the chain stores is a bad thing for the American public, and we say it again.

On another question he said the National Biscuit Company, Mennen Company, and one other organization, had appealed to the courts of the United States to allow them to sell to the chain store at the prices they wanted to sell to them at. One of the first things I pointed out in my first address this evening was that one of the ways the chain store was obtaining the best of this unfair competition was due to the fact that your production in this country is keyed to a very, very high point. That is the case with the Mennen Company and the National Biscuit Company. Those are tremendous organizations, and in order to maintain their capital interests they have to sell their product. If they sell some at a lower cost, that is all right, they keep their capital in operation; but they still have this tremendous field of the independent merchants they can sell to. This is the very basis of unfair competition.

They have also said that we said one of the principles of the chain store is unfair competition. We have at no time said one of the principles of the chain store is unfair competition.

We have said, however, that unfair competition is a method of carrying out the principle of the chain store.

They have said if the independent merchant can meet chain store competition, it is all right for him to stay in business, and that the only man the chain store forces out of business is the incompetent and the slothful merchant and that he should not be in business.

I ask you, how many of you people who are eligible to be retailers can afford to put in enough capital in your business to compete with the chain store? I dare say not one in the audience. Yet they say you can compete with the chain store, and if you cannot, you have no business in business. Yet we have pointed out that the basis of our American democracy is democracy.

They have pointed to the Melville Shoe Company and said they could show one case where the chain store was not carrying out the idea of concentrated ownership, and that if they could show one such case that they have entirely disproved the principle of concentrated ownership. Why did they not take the Kroger Grocery Company? There was a peculiar situation there that was of advantage to both. It has been done before, and it is obvious that it has been done before.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Fred Webber, Iowa

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The opposition have objected to my statement about the Melville Shoe Company, because they say it has been done before. Well, what of it? Maybe it will be done again. We hope so. The fact that it has been done before does not prove that it is not beneficial. Even if it has been done a thousand times, if it is worth while let us keep it up.

The point was this, if we can show one successful chain store company—and by the way, the Melville Shoe Company has some fifteen hundred stores, it is not just an infant corporation, it has several stores at that—if we can show one successful chain store company which does not use the unfair methods pointed out by the Affirmative, then that is proof that these

unfair methods are not inherent in chain store organization. If they are not inherent, they are not a part of the principle of the chain store system and therefore do not concern us this evening, and I have pointed out one example of a successful chain store company which does not use those practices.

Now, the Affirmative have finally come to agree that a part of the principle of the chain store is mass buying and mass distribution, and they are willing to admit those things are all right, but they attack the chain store on the one principle of concentrated ownership and management. On that point, as concerns the future of the United States, the gentlemen are very pessimistic.

It is my purpose in my last few minutes to remove a small amount of that pessimism, if possible, by showing that the reasoning on which that pessimism is founded is fundamentally inconsistent. They have pointed out that the chain store is founded on concentrated ownership and they have condemned it on that basis. They say that concentrated ownership always leads to dire results. It leads to unfair methods of competition; it leads to monopoly; it leads to political control and to almost everything else that has been bad in American history; and yet in the next breath they turn around and condemn the chain stores again because they make an employe class out of an employer class by extending the field of ownership throughout the entire organization.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, both of these things cannot be true. If the chain store is centralized so as to make it dangerous, then it cannot be decentralized so as to make it dangerous. The gentlemen are very inconsistent on this point.

The second fundamental inconsistency in their case is this: They have condemned the chain store because they say it is tending toward a monopoly, and a monopoly, they say, is exceedingly dangerous to the American people.

Now, we spoke very innocently about the Standard Oil Company some time ago, and they have been talking about it every time they gained the floor since then. They are willing, it seems, to compare the chain store to the Standard Oil Company. Here is the inconsistency in their case. In spite of the concentrated ownership of the Standard Oil Company, the American government was able to break the trust, as they pointed out, and to make it impossible for the Standard Oil Company to

squeeze the American people and cheat them. The American government, I say, was able to do that in spite of the evils of monopoly that they have pointed out.

Now then, why, Ladies and Gentlemen, is not the American government, in case the chain store tends too much toward a monopoly, able to do the same thing in their case? If it is able to in one case, it seems to me it must be able to in another.

Unless the Affirmative are willing to grant that should the chain store become too powerful a monopoly the American government can stop it, then their whole argument about the Standard Oil Company falls to the ground, and their case is still more based upon an inconsistency.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

William Wines, Northwestern

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The speaker who has just left the floor has said that the United States government stopped the Standard Oil Company's monopoly and so by analogy could stop the monopoly of the chain stores. If the United States government stopped the Standard Oil monopoly, and if it stops the monopoly of the chain stores, then it does it because the chain stores and the Standard Oil Company are detrimental to the best interests of the United States public, and that is what we have been trying to prove all evening before we were helped out by our opponents.

We do not say that the United States Government cannot stop a monopoly. We hope they can. But, if they do, they will do it because they think it is detrimental to the best interests of the United States public, which is precisely our point this evening.

Our opponents have said that the chain store is giving us a progressive type of business man. They spent their whole third speech, which according to debating technique is supposed to be the most important part of their case, proving that; and yet here is the honor roll of employes of one of the greatest chain stores, the Atlantic and Pacific Tea store, and it shows that after serving twenty-five years, out of the hundreds of employes on this roll, only twelve ever got to headquarters. Yet that is the progressive type of business man that the third speaker spent

the entire time of his speech trying to prove the chain stores were giving us.

They have also said the courts have upheld the legality of the chain store and of the chain store methods, and that they are perfectly legal. Ladies and Gentlemen, that is precisely what is wrong with them. The fact that they are legal does not mean they are a good thing by any manner of means. If they were, we should not have so much to fear. That is precisely the point.

They have also said that chain store stock represents a good investment, and, Ladies and Gentlemen, it certainly does, with the price-cutting and with the profits that are coming.

Certainly it is a good thing for the chain stores. We are not debating: "Resolved, That the principle of the chain store system is detrimental to the best interests of the chain stores, or the chain store stockholders." We know that is not so. But, and here is the most important part of the case, they have based their whole argument on the fact that the chain store is giving us great values.

We have kept still so far tonight on this point, but let me show you a few facts that are of tremendous importance. Columbia University of New York investigated this in a survey published in the *Journal of Commerce* in New York City for February and March, 1929. They investigated over one thousand grocery stores in the State of New York, and the independents were 5 per cent lower than the chain stores on average prices, and yet certain prices of the chain stores are very much lower than those of the independents.

What does that mean? It means this, that they are putting out leaders. That is, they will advertise Campbell's soup, or something of that sort, and they will sell it much more cheaply than the independent, until the independent has to drop it. Then the chain store drops it, and then in comes a private brand.

Then you should take into consideration this, that we have already quoted Professor Nystrom, who is one of the men employed by the chain stores, and he tells them about it, and our first speaker quoted his exact words this evening.

They have asked for some statistics to show they are concentrating the wealth in this country. The *Chicago Tribune* recently carried an article that there are negotiations for a \$300,000,000 merger between Sears, Roebuck and Company and

the J. C. Penney Company. There are other figures on the trend of concentration.

Now as to our very most important argument, the argument that the chain stores, by concentrating wealth are concentrating political power, they have had very little or nothing to say. If you will analyze the case of the Negative this evening, you will see that they have done just exactly what the American public has done, they have not gone beyond price cards. Their entire argument this evening has been based on simply comparing prices and saying they are efficient; and they have not even done that completely or they would have come to the conclusions reached by Columbia University that I have just quoted. Certainly the chain store can give you lower prices on certain things, the same as it gives the Negative its arguments for this evening, but certainly you should compare more fully as Columbia University has done.

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Edward Carmody, Iowa

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: After the smoke has blown away from this discussion we can probably look at it through the facts of the matter rather than the emotional attitude taken by both sides.

Let us look to the facts given by the gentleman who has just preceded me. He stated that the prices in the chain stores are not lower and he quoted as authority for that the Columbia University report. However, if he gave the full quotation of that report he should have stated that that report was re-quoted by Mr. Alexander, and Mr. Alexander himself states that that report was limited, because it took a few articles, and only a few articles; it was limited because it was taken from the City of New York itself, and that was not a representative city.

So we find that the chain stores today are giving lower prices, and that they are giving the American people the benefit of cheaper commodities.

In the second place, the gentlemen in this discussion have stated that the principles of the chain store are sound, but it is the application of these principles that they were objecting to.

We wish to remind them of the fact that the statement of the question is: "Resolved, That the principle of the chain store system is detrimental to the best interests of the community." In order to establish the Affirmative case, they must show that these principles are unsound, and not the application of these principles.

We maintain if the principles are sound, then the application of these principles can be changed and they will be changed if they are detrimental; but the Affirmative must show that the principles are unsound, and they have admitted that the principles are sound.

In the third place the gentleman has stated that the Negative have actually proved their case by pointing out the fact that the Standard Oil Company was cleaned up, and as a result of that we had the analogy of the Standard Oil Company with the chain store, and as a result of that the chain store today is a monopoly and a corrupt organization.

Here is where their analogy is at fault. We said if the chain store did go to the extent of creating a monopoly, the American Government could step in; but we contended in our constructive material that the chain store cannot go to that extent because they are ruled by sound economic rules, namely, the law of diminishing returns; and that rule applies to the chain store and it applies to the independent store, and because of that fact the chain stores cannot expand and will not expand to the extent of creating a monopoly.

In the third place, the gentlemen have pointed out the cooperative organization as an ideal remedy for the evils in the chain store. If the cooperative organization does have mass buying and mass distribution and centralized control to a degree, if it does have centralized control to a degree, and the gentleman of the Affirmative says that is correct, then that principle shall stand, because the question clearly says that the principle of the chain store system is detrimental to the community.

In the application of those principles the Negative of this evening has based its case upon three fundamental principles, mass buying, concentrated ownership and centralized control.

We have shown that the development of those principles is based upon sound economic rules. Second, that in the application of those principles certain benefits are given to you and me as individuals in the community, namely, that we are given

lower prices despite the fact that the figures quoted by the Affirmative are false. And third, we have pointed out that they tend to bring in a type of progressive individual into the community.

The American people actually want the chain store, when we consider the fact that sixty thousand people turned out in Cleveland, Ohio, on the day of the opening of the Sears Roebuck store in Cleveland. They are interested. Also when we consider that the Piggly Wiggly stores have increased their stores until they have them in 800 different cities today and are doing a business of \$200,000,000 a year. We again see that the people of America want the chain stores when we consider the fact that the annual sales of chain stores have increased 28 per cent in the last year, and we can see that the American people are patronizing the chain stores and they want them, they want that institution of the chain store, and as long as the chain stores have those advantages and are giving them to the American public, we, of the Negative, believe that the institution is an asset to the American people.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Jerome L. Fels, Northwestern

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In order to co-operate with the last speaker of the Negative in clearing the clouds away, we might suggest one of the best ways of clearing those clouds was to avoid misrepresentation. We never said that the principle, and the only principle, of the chain store was mass buying; and we never said that the principles of the chain store which we have described as detrimental, were sound and were the only principles of the chain store. We have rightly claimed that the gentlemen of the Negative are doing what a certain portion of the American people are doing, looking at price cards, touching the fringes of the question.

We have tried to get them to meet the essential underlying issue in this case, concentrated ownership, centralized management and distribution of profits with all its attendant evils.

The gentlemen have said if the Standard Oil Company was able to be overthrown as a monopoly by the United States

Government, let us go on and let the chain stores reach that same condition of a monopoly, and then let us overthrow it again.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have read every word of the debates in both Houses of Congress on the passage of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act in 1890. I have seen the subtleties used by senators and representatives in that Assembly. They did not dare to come out and vote no on the Anti-Trust Act, but they tried to pass it over on technicalities and delay it, and kill it. There were seventeen adjournments proposed on that bill, and I say we do not want to subject the American people to another test like that. We do not want to have another class war, and we say any system which would necessitate another class war is detrimental to the American people. We base that on the age-old truism that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The gentlemen have said the chain stores give lower prices through mass buying. They do give lower prices on some commodities, and they are very much astounded because we admit mass buying is a good thing; but we have admitted that there was another organization which did not have this dangerous thing of centralized control that can effect all these benefits of mass buying and give the American public really lower prices, and still keep the independents in business, the independents whom Herbert Hoover has called the basis of American prosperity and American happiness as a social and political institution.

We have shown the necessity for the chain store to get a great turnover, but at the same time the chain store is detrimental because it tends toward monopoly. The second speaker said he did not think the chain could reach a monopoly. We disagree with them on their economic conception of that point. The methods which are used are detrimental, namely, price cutting, which we have proved, and they are beating down the producer and forming a vicious circle, which is wrecking the farmer. And, we have also told you there are social implications and that due to the initiativeless employes resulting from the chain store system we have a class of individuals that tend to become merely a socialized machine; and the gentlemen of the Negative have absolutely failed to meet us on that.

We have shown how it destroys that individualism and initiative which as Herbert Hoover and other great political scientists have said is the basis for a democracy.

We have shown you what kind of an opportunity they afford for individuals, and we have shown that by the honor roll of the A. and P. We have shown you the chain has not only made a socialized, routinized machine, with unstable production and a top-heavy centralization of wealth, but as means of social control become more necessary the chain has removed that social control of the machine; and we have shown that the state legislatures are fully aware of that.

We have shown you what Justice Brandeis has told us as to what he thought of price cutting and of the chain, and we might say that the state which passed the most vicious legislation against the chain was the State of Pennsylvania, the big business of Pennsylvania, the state which has just sent Uncle Joe Grundy to the Senate. Yes, even old guard Pennsylvanians cannot tolerate the chain because they know there is no place in our democracy for a chain system and a monopoly.

We feel that democracy certainly is coincidental with the best interests of the United States. We feel the best interests of a democracy are against the chain store system, and that the chain store is essentially detrimental in every way to the best interests of the public.

CHAIRMAN YOAKUM—As I said at the beginning, we have Professor A. T. Weaver, Chairman of the Department of Speech of the University of Wisconsin, with us, who will discuss the debate and give us the decision.

CRITIC JUDGE

Professor A. T. Weaver

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I once heard of an elementary school teacher who had been talking to the boys and girls in her class about the opportunities of the American boy and the American girl. She had been saying that any boy born in America, and I suppose we ought to say any girl, too, can legitimately look forward to becoming President of the United States.

After she had continued with that line of argument for some time, one little boy who seemed to be somewhat bothered about something, raised his hand, and the teacher said to him, "What is it, Johnny?" He said, "Do you mean to say that I have a chance to be President?" "Why, certainly," she said. "Well," he said, "I would be glad to sell my chance to anybody that wants it for fifty cents."

I always feel when I get to this stage of the game that I would be glad to sell my chances for fifty cents. One always finds himself in a very awkward dilemma. If I do what I am scheduled to do here, in what order shall I do it? Shall I give you my vote and then run the risk of hoping that you will be interested in my reasons; or shall I presume upon your patience and withhold the one thing you want to hear me say, and go ahead and criticise the debate?

I have a feeling myself that public criticisms of a debate of this kind have to be made in such general terms that they do not mean much. I have been at this a long time and it is my distinct feeling that most of the things one would want to say as a critic of a debate ought not to be said to a public audience, but ought to be said to the debaters themselves.

However, Professor Cunningham told me, when he agreed to come up to the University of Wisconsin, that he wanted very much to make a public presentation of his reasons, and I suppose by that same sanction he wants me to do that.

I could stay here easily for an hour and a half in doing this, but it is now 10:10.

The critic judge is sometimes called an expert judge; a single expert judge of debate. Now, what do we mean by an expert judge, if there is such a thing? Of course, anyone who comes to the task of judging anything has to come as he is, with his prejudices, because everybody has some, and I think he loses more by attempting to divest himself of the prejudices which inhere in his nature and experience, than he gains. You have to exercise your judgment, colored and tintured as it is bound to be, by your prejudices.

A colleague of mine goes so far as to say that an expert judge is simply a judge whose prejudices are significant prejudices, that is, his prejudices grow out of some preconceived notions, some resultant of experiences which he has had in the field in which he is judging; and there are some things which

seem to me more important about debating than other things. I cannot go into all of those, because, as I say, really that is an impossible sort of thing; but I can indicate some high spots in the things which appeal to me as being important.

Of course, debating is a contest in spoken argument. There cannot be any two ways about that. That means that speaking is at least one tremendously vital element in the process.

That does not mean that it is unimportant to prepare your argument. That does not mean it is unimportant to find all the evidence you can find and to manufacture it as best you can into proof; but, after all, what we are judging here tonight is the efficiency of people in doing the task of a speaker after he has made his preliminary arrangements as to the material which he is going to use.

So speaking is, in my judgment, one of the very most important factors in this whole business. If I find two teams that are approximately equal in other things which seem to me important, and one of them seems to be superior in speaking, naturally that weighs with me very heavily.

I said I was interested in their evidence. I am interested in the demonstration of the grasp which people have on their subject matter; how much they really seem to know about it. There are lots of ways in which you form your opinions about that. When they are hard pressed to support something they have said, what do they have to support it with? When there is an attack in an unsuspected place, do they rush to the defense of the position they have taken, or do they evade it and talk about something else? How alert are they in following the argument as it develops? If there is a fumble, do they seem to be around where that is, or do they seem to be somewhere else? How adaptable are they? Do they argue against something which they thought was going to be presented, or do they argue against what is presented by the other side? How able are they in picking the weak points in the opposition, and talking about those? What skill do they show in analyzing their job?

Now, if you will permit me to make a few observations about the two teams, I will give you my decision.

I do not honestly think either team did much of a job in analysis. That is a nice thing to get up here and say about these people who have worked as hard as these people did and being

on the platform I may get mobbed, but I honestly do not think either team did much of a job of analysis.

I listened to hear what the three points were; I listened to hear what partition of the task they have worked out, and I find overlapping on both sides. A man announces he is going to talk about one thing and his colleague about something else, and then he talks about what he said his colleague was going to talk about, and his colleague talks about what he said he was going to talk about, and back and forth all the way through the hearing.

One of my pet hobbies, I suppose, is a special feeling of concern about the matters of formal logic. Some people, I suppose, do not pay much attention to that or care much about it. They do not care whether the material is divided up into mutually exclusive compartments, so far as it can be put there, and I was a little bit pained by the careless way in which both teams laid out the argument and announced as to just how they had agreed to parcel out the task among themselves.

When it comes to evidence, how much the people knew about it, it seemed to me fairly even. I have been working with two teams on this very question, for the last five or six weeks, as long as these people have been working. I know some people think that this is a one-sided question. I do not think so. We have people on both sides. In both our debating teams tonight I should say we came as near to making an equal division as was possible in terms of human division. We took our teams out for practice before a neutral audience and we allowed the audience to vote. The affirmative team got 162 votes and the negative team got 160 votes. We took them out one other time and there was a fairly equal division of opinion about the debating.

I suppose the average so-called inexpert judge does allow his opinions about the question to weigh rather heavily. I think it is a little easier for the Negative to demonstrate their side of this case than it is for the Affirmative. So I think you have here a situation in which the Affirmative is making what must essentially be a prophecy and an emotional appeal; and you have on the Negative a lot of cold, hard facts about economies in the chain store system. You cannot very well get away from that. I understand that situation and I do not think I am being unduly influenced by it.

I think the Negative did pretty well in standing where they figured out they were going to stand on the matter of what the principle was; and I thought the Affirmative had that pretty well figured out, too.

I think there is a chance for a mean sort of argument about the premise here. I do not think this is an awfully well phrased question. I sometimes marvel about the statement of questions that we get. We just got nine more to vote on the other day, and as far as I could figure out, let us say there were half of them that would pass in an argumentative course at the end of a course, due to the inability of people to phrase debate questions correctly. About half of the debate coaches in the Conference seem to be able to do that satisfactorily. You will find a question on the list that you think raises an interesting issue, but it is not very well stated. I think the principle of the chain store system is about as hard to get rounded up as anything could be. I think the Affirmative made a good attempt at that; and I think the Negative side stated what they ought to state and what they thought about matters really essential.

Now, obviously I have got twelve pages, more or less, of notes here, and I cannot bore you with all of it. I should like to go over it with the teams.

I think in speaking the Negative showed a good deal more freedom from their notes; more audience contact. They actually looked at people all the time they talked; they did not seem to be terribly concerned about what was on their cards. That was not quite so true of the Affirmative, in my judgment, whatever that is worth; and I am inclined to think that on the issues which stood out most sharply in the discussion about—let us say three-fifths of the time, that is a good fraction—I would say roughly three-fifths of the time the Negative seemed to have a little the better of it. When the Affirmative made a statement that the Negative could take hold of, they generally followed that right down and stayed with it a little longer than the Affirmative did.

I heard about a judge over at Holland, Michigan, who had a case presented to him, and after he had listened to the whole case he said, "I have heard the plaintiff and I have heard the defendant, and I shall now take the case under advisement and I will decide next Thursday in favor of the plaintiff."

I really think sometimes I would do a better job in deciding a case like this. You know what I am deciding now. I will simply say in my opinion one of these teams was superior to the other in technique of debate; and I think sometimes if I had opportunity to retire to the judge's chambers and sit down with my notes and meditate on it for two or three days, I might be a little surer of my position; but I offer it to you for what it is worth on the spur of the moment, and I say to you it is my honest opinion if I had to choose one of these two debating teams on the showing tonight, and take them out as my debating team—that is a pretty fair test, is it not?—if I had to say, “I want you to represent the University of Wisconsin tomorrow night, choosing you on what little I know about it on the basis of what you did here tonight,” I should be obliged to take the negative team.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE CHAIN STORE SYSTEM

Prepared by Miss Eleanor F. Lewis
Reference Librarian, Orrington Lunt Library
Northwestern University

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Grant Co., W. T. Library. Chain stores, department and variety; a bibliography. Jl. '28.
- National Chain Store Association. Chain store bibliography. 4p. The Association. 205 E. 42d St. N.Y. '30.
- United States. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Chain store bibliography. J. H. Stehman, comp. 10p. mime. The Bureau. Wash. D.C. My. 1, '28.
- United States. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Chain stores, a reading list. typew. The Bureau. Wash. D.C. '29.
- United States. Domestic Commerce Division. Chain store bibliography. My. 1, '28.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Baxter, W. J. Chain store distribution and management. xvi, 279p. il. \$5. Harper. N.Y. '28.
- Bloomfield, Daniel. Trends in retail distribution. (Handbook Series III. vol. 3) 509p. \$2.40. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '30.
- Central Union Trust Company of New York. Chain store and element of revolution. 46p. gratis. The Company. 70 Broadway. N.Y. '29.
- Coles, G. J. Chain store economics and organization. 22p. pa. 1s. Melbourne Univ. Press. Victoria, Australia. '28.
- Darby, W. D. Story of the chain store. 159p. il. \$2. (Dry Goods Economist) Textile Pub. Co. 239 W. 39th St. N.Y. '28.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. 14th ed. 5:190-1. Chain stores.

Contains chart showing position of chain stores in all cities in the United States.

Greer, H. C. Chain store accounting. x,312p. il. \$3. McGraw-Hill. N.Y. '24.

Guernsey, John. Retailing tomorrow. xi,228p. \$5. Textile Pub. Co. N.Y. '29.

Hayward, W. S. and White, P. Chain stores, their management and operation. 3d ed. xiii,583p. il. \$5. McGraw-Hill. N.Y. '28.

Jones, A. C. Piggly Wiggly store management. 3d ed. 151p. \$1. H. H. Lestico Pub. Co. 1114 E. 8th St. Los Angeles.

Lestico, H. H. and Barnett, H. R. 1929 annual of chain stores directory. 2d ed. \$2. H. H. Lestico Pub. Co. 1114 E. 8th St. Los Angeles. '29.

Lohr, L. W. Methods and policies in chain drug store merchandising used by the Walgreen Company. M.B.A. thesis. '25. N.U.

Manual of chain store companies. 5-160p. B. P. Moore and Associates. 82 Wall St. N.Y. '27.

Mullen, W. Chain store integration. M.B.A. thesis. '23. N.U.

National Chain Store Association. Are anti-chain store laws unconstitutional? two important judicial decisions (the Maryland and North Carolina decisions) 18p. gratis. The Association. 205 E. 42d St. N.Y. '29.

Palmer, J. L. What about chain stores? 196p. 75c. American Management Assn. 20 Vesey St. N.Y. '29.

Sherman anti-trust law with amendments. '22.

United States. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Chain-store developments in Great Britain. R. S. Charles. (Trade Inf. Bull. no. 697) 16p. 10c. Supt. of Documents. Wash. D.C. '30.

United States. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Domestic commerce series no. 5. Commercial and industrial organizations of the United States. rev. ed. Ja. 1, '29.

United States. 70th Cong., 2d sess. H. doc. 546, pt. 1:1. Resale price maintenance, letter transmitting report on its general economic and legal aspects. '29.

Western states chain Grocers Association. 1928 annual of chain store progress. 104p. pa. 50c. Chain Store Manager. 1114 E. 8th St. Los Angeles. '29.

- Whitaker, J. R. Organization of chain grocery companies in relation to scientific merchandising. (thesis) 134p. priv. ptd. Univ. of Pa. '29.
- Wood, C. W. Passing of normalcy. ix,309p. \$3. B. C. Forbes. N.Y. '29.

REFERENCES IN *New York Times*

- L. Criscuolo says chains do not strifle enterprise of individuals but drive unfit out of business. *New York Times*. Ag. 12, '28. Section 2, p. 7, col. 7.
- L. L. Jay says that value lies in fact that mass sales benefit both consumer and investor. *New York Times*. Ja. 20, '29. Section 2, p. 15, col. 2.
- Marshall Field plans chain of retail stores. *New York Times*. D. 30, '28. Section 2, p. 4, col. 5.

SPEECHES IN *Congressional Record*

- Kelly, Clyde. Price standardization, the F. T. C., and chain store competition. U. S. Congressional Record. 69:1106-10. Ja. 6, '28.
- Kelly, Clyde. Standard prices for standard goods. U. S. Congressional Record. 67:11071-8. Je. 6, '26.
- Kelly, Clyde. Why chain stores grow. Speech on fair trade bill, H.R. 11, before the House of Representatives, January 19, 1929. U.S. Congressional Record. 70:1919-27. Ja. 18, '29.
- Resolution on operation of chain store system and inquiry of F. T. C. regarding. U.S. Congressional Record. 69:8522. My. 12, '28.

ADVERTISING

- Printers' Ink. 147:128-9. Je. 20, '29. Chain with limited distribution advertises nationally; Walgreen drug stores. F. Read.
- Sales Management. 17:217. Ja. 26, '29. Woolworth Company, converted to advertising after fifty years, to start \$1,500,000 campaign. L. M. Hughes.
- Sales Management. 18:549+. Je. 15, '29. United Cigars enter national advertising; \$2,000,000 budget. A. C. Allen.

FINANCE

- American Bankers Association Journal. 22:229+. S. '29. The chain store side. R. W. Lyons.
- American Bankers Association Journal. 22:457+. N. '29. Country bank and the chain store account. C. F. Zimmerman.
- Bankers Magazine. 120:504. Ap. '30. Chain store viewpoint of banking service. R. W. Lyons.
- Bankers Magazine. 120:505-6. Ap. '30. Banker's viewpoint of chain store accounts. C. F. Zimmerman.
- Barron's Weekly. O. 7, '29. p. 3, 8+. Chain store stocks as investments.
- Burroughs Clearing House. 13:20-1+. Je. '29. Finance and the chain stores: looking into the future of chain store securities as the dealer sees it.
- Burroughs Clearing House. 13:20-1+. Jl. '29. Finance and the chain stores; an interview with Clermont Cartwright. F. B. Barton.
- Chain Store Age. N. '29. p. 43-6. Chain store and the local bank.
- Chain Store Review. N. '29. p. 14-15+. Extent of "public stake" in chain stores. Table.
- Financial Age. 60:369-70. O. 12, '29. Chain store and the local bank.
- Magazine of Wall Street. 43:917. Mr. 23, '29. Representative chain store stocks compared.

LEGISLATION

- American Economic Review. 19:sup. 56-8. Mr. '29. Law and economics; resale price maintenance.
- American Lumberman. Mr. 9, '29. p. 63. Tax bill aimed at chain stores (Ohio); chain store problem in Minnesota.
- Business Week. p. 13. Ja. 8, '30. Chain store tax upheld by North Carolina court.
- Chain Store Age. Ja. '29. p. 31-3. United States Supreme Court condemns anti-chain store law.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 127:2449-50. N. 3, '28. Legislation taxing chain stores doing business in North Carolina declared unconstitutional.
- Food Distribution. p. 7-9. My. '30. Kentucky puts a new kick into chain store legislation.

- National Petroleum News. 21:20. Mr. 27, '29. Declare chain store laws unconstitutional.
- Printers' Ink. 146:17-20. F. 14, '29. What the Trade Commission told Congress about price maintenance; analysis of the report itself.
- Printers' Ink. 149:133-4. O. 3, '29. How the anti-trust laws affect chain stores. W. J. Donovan.
- Wisconsin Legislative Ref. Lib., comp. Legislation against chain stores: digest of the laws of all states which place special restrictions or taxes upon chain stores. 50c. My. '28. Obtainable only thru Public Affairs Information Service.

LOCATION

- National Real Estate Journal. Jl. 8-22, '29. p. 39-41, 49-51. Traffic, location, trends as considered by the chain store. Map.

MAIL ORDER STORES

- Printers' Ink. 147:17-20. My. 9, '29. How you can benefit by the growth of mail-order chains; rural independent retailer field open to advertised brands. G. A. Nichols.
- Sales Management. 16:475-7+, 551-2+. N. 24-D. 1, '28. New sales problems created by Montgomery Ward chain stores. G. B. Everitt.

MANAGEMENT

- Magazine of Business. 55:274-5+. Mr. '29. Chain store learns ing; Schulte-United 5 cent to \$1 stores. A. N. McFayden.
- Nation's Business. 17:33-4+. S. '29. Chains have evils too. W. T. Grant.
- Sales Management. 18:602+. Je. 22, '29. Hahn outlines management policies behind department store chain. L. Hahn.

PURCHASING

- Magazine of Business. 54:674-5+. D. '28. Certainty in retailing; Schulte-United 5 cent to \$1 stores. A. N. McFayden.
- Printers' Ink. 148:3-4+. S. 5, '29. What chain store buying means to advertising. A. V. Vars.

STATISTICS

- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 127:1896. O. 6, '28. Chain store financing aggregating over \$85,000,000 sets new record in first nine months.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 128:327. Ja. 18, '29. Chain store sales in 1928 show large increase over preceding year.
- Journal of Industry and Finance. Jl. '28. p. 8-10. A revelation of chain store growth; their large share of retail trade disclosed by the census distribution in all cities.
- New York Produce Review and American Creamery. 69:1302. Ap. 23, '30. Sales of Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company exceed billion dollars.
- Printers' Ink. 149:156. O. 3, '29. Chain stores as a business index. Sales Management. 21:518+. Mr. 22, '30. A. and P. sales reach \$90,000,000 a month; chain now national!
- United States. Dept. of Commerce. Statistical Abstract of the United States. C18. 14:1925. p. 310. Indexes of value of sales of chain stores.
- United States. Federal Reserve Bulletin. N. '22. p. 1358. Average monthly value of sales in chain stores.
- Women's Wear Daily. Ja. 10, '29. Sec. 1, p. 1. 1928 sales of 19 chains totaled \$895,620,867; gained 12.6 per cent over 1927.
- Sales of chain stores and mail-order houses are published in monthly numbers of the Federal Reserve Bulletin.
- For statistics on sales volume of chain stores see United States Dept. of commerce. Yearbook, 1922-date. C18. 26:date.

VOLUNTARY CHAIN MOVEMENT

- Commerce and Finance. 18:358. F. 13, '29. Great growth of voluntary chains.
- Commercial America. S. '29. p. 33-5+. Voluntary chain; its growth and significance.
- Printers' Ink Monthly. 18:31-2+. Mr. '29. How the voluntary chain operates; cooperative retailer buying organizations.
- Printers' Ink Monthly. 18:52+. My. '29. Significance of the voluntary chain.

GENERAL REFERENCES

- Advertising and Selling. 11:21-2. Je. 13, '28. The chain store, menace or blessing: some thoughts pro and con on the forthcoming Federal Trade Commission investigation. E. M. West.

- Advertising and Selling. 11:28+. Jl. 25, '28. Chain stores, too, have their problems. A. A. Haring.
- Advertising and Selling. 12:26+. Ja. 9, '29. Drug and other chain stores in England. C. E. Haring.
- Advertising and Selling. 14:23-4+. D. 25, '29. Is chain store organization a blessing in disguise? R. B. Simpson.
- Advertising and Selling. 15:22+. My. 28, '30. Why we are fighting the chains. W. W. Caslow.
- American Bankers Association Journal. 21:466+. N. '28. How the small bank can deal with chain stores; average chain store in a small community does not carry an adequate balance and expects much for nothing. J. A. Murphy.
- American Bankers Association Journal. 22:307-8, 424. O. '29. Great web of chain banking.
- American Economic Review. 18:sup. 19-24, 27-8. Mr. '28. Present status and future prospects of chains of department stores; with reply. E. A. Filene.
- American Federationist. 36:550-3. My. '29. Organization among chain store employees.
- Annalist. 34:252+. Ag. 9, '29. Canadian independents meet chains with chain weapons.
- Annals of the American Academy. 139:220-5. S. '28. The chain store and its distribution.
- Barron's. 8:3+. Je. 4, '28. Chain-store "issue" arises; retailer and wholesaler seek government aid in struggling against "menace."
- Barron's. 8:3+. D. 31, '28. The chains and the independents: a consideration of economic forces.
- Barron's. 9:21. O. 28, '29. Chain store invasion aids independents.
- Bureau Farmer (Connecticut ed.) 5:13-15. Ap. '30. Chain stores and agriculture. J. E. Boyle.
- Burroughs Clearing House. 12:14-16+. D. '28. Looking at the chain stores: developments in the business and their significance to the banker. F. B. Barton.
- Burroughs Clearing House. 13:17-19+. Mr. '29. Are chain stores heartless? il. F. B. Barton.
- Burroughs Clearing House. 13:20-2+. S. '29. Why the chains act that way: chain store methods that should be revealing to banker and merchant. F. B. Barton.
- Business Review. p. 5-8. My. 27, '30. Chain store problem. W. A. Krick.

- Business Week. p. 21-2. Mr. 5, '30. Chains face real fight as South's politicians seize issue.
- Business Week. p. 22. Mr. 12, '30. Chains do only 10 per cent of Canada's trade.
- Business Week. p. 10. Mr. 26, '30. Southern states aim sales tax to bring down chains.
- Business Week. p. 22+. Ap. 9, '30. In thirty-five states two hundred sixty bodies are fighting chain stores.
- Chain Store Age. p. 23-4+. F. '28. Why chain store distribution serves the public best. E. A. Filene.
- Chain Store Age. p. 27-9. O. '28. We can't overlook a good man. (J. C. Penney Co.) L. V. Day.
- Chain Store Age. p. 27. N. '28. The chain's place in the present scheme of distribution.
- Chain Store Age. (General merchandise ed.) p. 44+. N. '28. What chance has a man in a chain? Hiram Blauvelt.
- Chain Store Age. p. 41-3+. Ap. '29. Our (Sears, Roebuck and Co.) part in chain store progress.
- Chain Store Age. p. 42+. Je. '29. Chain store of tomorrow.
- Chain Store Age. p. 55-6. N. '29. Outlook for the chain store.
- Chain Store Age. p. 58-60+. N. '29. Chain's contribution to the nation's welfare.
- Chain Store Age. p. 60-2+. N. '29. Chain store and the community.
- Chain Store Review. O. '29. p. 14+. How a congressman views the chain stores.
- Chicago Commerce. p. 10+. S. 29, '28. Future of the chain store: research man sees growth of chains assured by economic soundness of their basic idea.
- Chicago Commerce. p. 11-12. S. 29, '28. Individual store's future: economist points out danger to chains of their size lessening margin of net profit.
- Coal Age. 332:344-5. D. '27. Can company stores meet the new competition? N. A. Brisco.
- Collier's. 83:8-9. Mr. 30, '29. One store after another. J. T. Flynn.
- Collier's. 83:8-9. Ap. 27, '29. Up against the chains. J. T. Flynn.
- Commerce and Finance. 17:1675-6. Ag. 8, '28. The intelligent consumer's guide to individualism and the chain store system. C. S. Johnson.

- Commerce and Finance. 18:66819. Mr. 27, '29. Revolution in distribution. R. E. Allen.
- Commerce and Finance. 18:787-9. Ap. 10, '29. Fifty years of Woolworth. C. W. Steffler.
- Commerce and Finance. 18:1487-8. Jl. 10, '29. The limitations of the chain store. A. Fertig.
- Commerce Monthly. p. 3-12. D. '28. Chain store in the grocery field. A. M. Michener.
- Commerce Reports. no. 5. p. 259-62. F. 4, '29. The chain store movement in France: development includes many lines; recent expansion rapid.
- Commerce Reports. no. 17. p. 257-8. Ap. 29, '29. Danish trade conditions favorable to chain store development.
- Commerce Reports. no. 18. p. 369-70. My. 6, '29. Chain store development in Mexico.
- Commerce Reports. no. 21. p. 516. My. 7, '29. Chain stores in Germany.
- Commerce Reports. no. 36. p. 647-9. S. 9, '29. Chain store development in Switzerland held in check by the cooperative and retail stores.
- Commercial America. p. 15-16+. Ap. '28. Chain store; an American institution. Chart.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 128:2920. My. 4, '29. Attributes chain store success to use of economic principles. R. W. Lyons.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 126:3067. My. 19, '28. Senate (U. S.) resolution calling for inquiry into operation of chain store system.
- Cooperation. 14:163-4. S. '28. Chain store development and the Grange cooperative wholesale.
- Cooperation. 15:26-8. F. '29. Cooperative, the chain store, and the answer.
- Cooperation. 15:143-4. Ag. '29. Chain store competition.
- Country Gentlemen. 95:1-19. F. '30. Chains to meet chains. Samuel Crowther.
- Current Affairs. p. 2. O. 22, '28. How independent merchants can meet chain competition. E. A. Filene.
- Dun's International Review. 54:38-40+. S. '29. Combating the encroaching force of chain-store distribution.
- Editorial Research Reports. p. 425-35. My. 21, '28. Development of chain store merchandising.

- Editorial Research Reports. p. 287-302. Ap. 24, '30. (price on application) Chain store problem in 1930. Paul Webbink.
- Export Trade and Finance. p. 11-13+. Je. 21, '30. Chain stores in Africa. Eric Rosenthal.
- Exporters and Importers Journal. p. 16-17. Je. 21, '29. Are the chain stores a benefit or a menace: do they seriously threaten the welfare of individual merchants?
- Financial World. p. 1021-2. N. 29, '20. Piggly Wiggly stores.
- Forbes Magazine. p. 123-4. My. 13, '22. Story behind 187 stores (Chain grocery stores).
- Forbes Magazine. 24:19-21+. Jl. 15, '29. Real problem of the chains. C. W. Wood.
- Forbes Magazine. 23:13-15+. Mr. 1, '29. Why the chains cannot dominate. N. M. Clark.
- Harper. 158:356-66. F. '29. Chain-store mind. J. R. Sprague.
- Information Service. p. 3-4. O. 6, '28. Big business in retail trade. Tables.
- Journal of Accountancy. 48:260-8. O. '29. Development and effect of chain stores. A. H. Morrill.
- Journal of Business. 2:272-90. Jl. '29. Economic and social aspects of chain stores. J. L. Palmer.
- Journal of Commerce. p. 7. Je. '22. Evils of chain stores. II.
- Journal of Retailing. 4:3-6. Ap. '28. Chain store growth and total volume of retail trade. Table. Chart.
- Literary Digest. 98:70-1. S. 15, '28. How the small merchant competes with chain stores.
- Magazine of Business. 53:721. Je. '28. Picture of chain store infiltration, New York City.
- Magazine of Business. 53:735. Je. '28. Battle of the chains. M. H. Karker.
- Magazine of Business. 54:28-30+. Jl. '28. Challenge of the chains accepted by five hundred Pacific Coast grocers.
- Magazine of Business. 54:506-7. N. '28. What of the chain store on Main Street? Map.
- Magazine of Business. 55:274-5. Mr. '29. What makes a merchant; interview with A. N. McFadyen.
- Magazine of Wall Street. 42:826-9. S. 8, '28. What is the cause for the remarkable growth of chain store systems? G. K. Wilson.
- Magazine of Wall Street. 43:384-5+. D. 29, '28. Billions at stake in next move of chain merchandisers. E. A. Filene.

- Magazine of Wall Street. 43:915-16+. Mr. 23, '29. Coming battle of the chains. H. J. Knapp.
- Magazine of Wall Street. 45:520-2+. Ja. 25, '30. Mass production must have mass consumption. E. A. Filene.
- Management Review. 18:206-7. Je. '29. Chain adopts plan of decentralizing; W. T. Grant Company. C. E. Freeman.
- Manufacturers Record. 96:45-51. Ag. 8, '29. Chain stores present their side of the case.
- Manufacturers Record. 96:59. S. 5, '29. Chain store methods attacked.
- Market Growers Journal. 46:308. Ap. 1, '30. Chain store reflections.
- Monthly Labor Review. 30:550-1. Mr. '30. Women in limited-price chain stores.
- Nation. 127:568-70. N. 28, '28. Chain stores, the revolution in retailing.
- Nation. 130:544-5. My. 7, '30. War on the chain store. H. W. Schacter.
- National Association of Retail Druggists Journal. 46:647-51. Jl. 19, '28. Shall the chain store be allowed to destroy the opportunity of future generations, make paupers of the wage-earner and bankrupts of the merchant, farmer, banker, and property owner of today?
- National City Bank of New York. p. 83-7. My. '30. Trends in merchandising.
- National Real Estate Journal. p. 26-9. F. 18, '29. Chain stores; their influence on real estate.
- National Republic. p. 26, 48. O. '29. How about the retailer? Julius Klein.
- Nation's Business. 16:17+. My. '28. The chain store and your community.
- Nation's Business. 16:62+. S. '28. Together we're licking the chains.
- Nation's Business. 17:82+. Mr. '29. Local chamber and the chain. A. S. Dudley.
- Nation's Business. 17:70+. Ap. '29. The chain store comes of age. S. B. Botsford.
- Nation's Business. 17:68+. Jl. '29. Can the chains end price cutting? H. M. Foster.
- Nation's Business. 17:67-8+. Ag. '29. Can the chain keep on growing? O. F. Rost.

- Nation's Business. 17:147-8+. S. '29. Chains help the wholesaler. S. M. Bond.
- Nation's Business. 17:17-19+. O. '29. How the chain store helps the independent. G. B. Everitt.
- Nation's Business. 17:28-30+. D. '29. Will chains make factories their slaves? H. M. Foster.
- New Republic. 54:210-12. Ap. 4, '28. Farewell to the shopkeeper.
- North American Review. 226:440-4. O. '28. Big business and the little man.
- Opportunity. 7:210-13. Jl. '29. The Colored Merchants' Association stores face the chains.
- Outlook. 152:90-1. My. 15, '29. Troubled waters of distribution. M. M. Black, jr.
- Outlook. 152:606-7. Ag. 14, '29. Mammoth stores, preferred. E. F. Roberts.
- Printed Salesmanship. 54:15-17. S. '29. Another hand at the throat of advertised products. J. C. Aspley.
- Printers' Ink. 142:81-4. F. 2, '28. Chain store and the manufacturers are not enemies. S. Rabinovitz.
- Printers' Ink. 143:17-20. Je. 14, '28. Fill a need or fail; the future of the chain store. W. T. Grant.
- Printers' Ink. 145:144-5+. O. 18, '28. Chain stores organize for strong defensive.
- Printers' Ink. 145:96-7+. N. 15, '28. Chain store rules that point the way to right selling. G. A. Nichols.
- Printers' Ink. 146:157-8+. Ja. 17, '29. Jobber gives dealers a complete plan of meeting chain competition.
- Printers' Ink. 146:105-6+. Ja. 31, '29. Why I believe in price maintenance; the Capper-Kelly bill.
- Printers' Ink. 147:85-6. Ap. 18, '29. What the Trade Commission is asking the chain stores.
- Printers' Ink. 147:88+. Ap. 18, '29. How manufacturers are catering to the ten cent market.
- Printers' Ink. 149:168+. O. 31, '29. Chain store is a public necessity. E. C. Sams.
- Printers' Ink. 149:3-4+. D. 12, '29. Man power—the most important thing in expansion; talk about a Sears, Roebuck-Penney combination.
- Printers' Ink. 150:91-2. Mr. 20, '30. Battle without gloves; Piggly Wiggly Saunders swings a wicked right at Henderson,

- Printers' Ink. 151:110+. My. 1, '30. How chain-store managers can remove the foreign taint; a businesslike handling of local requests for contributions.
- Public Affairs. p. 18. D. '24. Is the chain store a benefit?
- Queen's Quair. 36:313-25. Spring. '29. The chain store (Canada).
- Radio Retailing. 10:62-3+. Ag. '29. The menace of the chain store; an opportunity for radio leadership in your community through cooperation with independent merchants and jobbers elsewhere.
- Retail Ledger. p. 8. Jl. 1, '29. Are these twelve charges against the chains true?
- Retail Ledger p. 9. O. 2, '29. Is the chain store system really sound? Are the chains destined to go ahead or have they reached the peak of their progress?
- Retailing. p. 3+. Jl. 13, '29. Must the chain store become "civic conscious"? Maud Robinson.
- Review of Reviews. 78:109. Jl. '28. Chain stores and the grocery man.
- S. Walter Thompson News Bulletin. p. 1-11. Mr. '29. Why the chain store?
- Sales Management. 16:670-1+. D. 15, '28. Why shoe manufacturers must operate retail chains. H. C. North.
- Sales Management. 16:722-3+. D. 22, '28. Chain price cutting of advertised lines. F. S. Gates.
- Sales Management. 17:70+. Ja. 12, '29. Butler Brothers wholesale chain enters the retail field. J. True.
- Sales Management. 17:396-7. F. 16, '29. Butler starts to reconcile new chains with independents. L. M. Hughes.
- Sales Management. 18:298. My. 11, '29. Leaders debate mass merchandising at United States Chamber meeting. J. True.
- Sales Management. 18:388-90. My. 25, '29. Why we are nailing our flag to the mast of independent retailing; John Lucas and Co., inc., Philadelphia. E. T. Trigg.
- Sales Management. 18:587+. Je. 22, '29. Why have the chain stores succeeded? R. W. Lyons.
- Sales Management. 19:387-8. Ag. 31, '29. Elgin declares open war on price-cutters.
- Sales Management. 19:584. S. 28, '29. Are chain store systems a national menace?
- Sales Management. 22:110-11+. Ap. 5, '30. Public antagonism—a knife in the heart of the chain store. J. True.

- Saturday Evening Post. 201:32-4. D. 8, '28. Middleman. J. R. Sprague.
- Saturday Evening Post. 200:10-11. F. 22, '30. Community and the chain store. J. C. Penney and Samuel Crowther.
- Southern Workman. 58:298-301. Jl. '29. Meeting chain store competition through cooperation. A. L. Holsey.
- System. 41:393-7+. Ap. '22. What kept our business growing through 1921. S. G. Kresge, owner of chain of 5 and 10 cent stores.
- Tea and Coffee Trade Journal. 54:271+. F. '28. What chains save the public; reported as \$300,000,000 a year less than if all groceries were sold by independent retailers.
- Thrift Magazine. p. 7-8. Jl. '28. Is the chain store a menace or benefit to community welfare? Table.
- United States. Women's Bureau Bulletin. 71:1-56. '30. Women in 5 and 10 cent stores and limited price chain department stores. M. E. Pidgeon.
- Western Advertising. p. 51-2. My. '29. Is business to be bound by the chains? Louis Honig.
- Women's Wear Daily. Sec. 1, p. 15. F. 27, '29. Simultaneous movements to curb chains noted in measures in several states.
- World's Work. 49:212-18. D. '24. Do you buy from a chain? Three billion dollars spent last year in these stores.
- World's Work. 58:80-5. Ja. '29. China store era. C. W. Steffler.
- World's Work. 59:61-3. Ap. '30. Corner grocer talks about chain store competition. F. Tilden.

CHAPTER III

ARBITRATION OF INTERNATIONAL
DISPUTES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

versus

VICTORIA COLLEGE OF NEW ZEALAND
UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: *That all matters of international dispute can be settled by arbitration.*

This debate took place at the McMillan Theatre in New York City, on December 12, 1929, between an Affirmative team representing Columbia University and, for the Negative, a team which toured this country last Fall, representing in debates with a number of colleges and universities, Victoria College of New Zealand University. No decision was made on the merits of the debate, but the audience voted in favor of the Negative on the merits of the question. This report was secured thru Mr. Arthur B. Krim, Debate Manager for Columbia College Debate Council.

BRIEF

ARBITRATION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION :

- A. Public opinion is against war as never before.
 - i. Our drama and literature are evidence of it.
 - a. Goethe says that the public opinion of any people is expressed continually by its drama and literature.
 - b. We find plays like *Journey's End* and novels like *Farewell to Arms* and *All Quiet on the Western Front* are winning universal popularity.
 - (1) They show war as something terrible, ugly, devastating and barbarous.
 - (a) There is no hero worship, no enemy to be vanquished, no victory for the victor, no special suffering for the conquered.
 - (2) They present a strong contrast to the war literature of 1916-1917.
 - (a) Of which Empey's *Over the Top* is an example.
- B. The Affirmative propose arbitration as the substitute for war.
 - 1. They do not champion any special form arbitration has taken in the past.
 - 2. They champion the general principle of arbitration as an instrument of international justice, that can peacefully and rationally settle controversies between nations.

- I. There are several factors contributing to the increasing effectiveness of arbitration as a substitute for war.
 - A. The present attitude of public opinion is in favor of peace.
 1. In many quarters there is a profound hatred of war.
 - B. The factors that have been instrumental in bringing about wars in the past are gradually disappearing.
 1. Nationalism and national honor are no longer so important as they have been.
 - a. They have been the chief causes of past wars.
 - b. While the Treaty of Versailles developed more national states than existed before the World War, the nationalistic spirit found before the War has been on the wane.
 - (1) Economic enterprises are developing international significance.
 2. Disarmament is growing in favor everywhere.
 - a. Large armies and navies have always been a potential cause of war.
 - (1) As long as nations are prepared for war there is no reason why they can't go to war at a moment's notice.
 - b. Remove large armies and navies and nations will be forced to use rational and peaceful means in settling controversies.
 3. Past wars were often due to the existence of important national figures.
 - a. Cardinal Richelieu established a powerful France thru foreign intrigues and wars.
 - b. Bismarck brought about the bloody Franco-Prussian struggle to make a unified Germany out of a number of heterogeneous states.
 - c. Garibaldi resorted to war to add Rome to the fast forming Italian nation.
 - d. Nationalistic figures are influenced or overshadowed today by the world's international attitude.
 - (1) The Soviet regime in Russia recently prevented a war with China.

- (2) Mussolini's nationalistic ambitions are strongly curbed internally by Italian diplomats, and externally by an internationally minded world.
 - (3) France has been freed by death from the hold of her nationalist, Clemenceau.
 - (4) Premier MacDonald of England is preaching peace, disarmament and international good will.
 - (a) His views are strongly endorsed and advocated by President Hoover of America.
- 4. The incentive of economic advantage that has caused wars in the past no longer exists.
 - a. There will be no economic profits in future wars.
 - (1) Every nation has the roots of its prosperity inextricably interlaced with those of other nations.
 - (2) By entering a future war a nation would only imperil its own shipping, destroy its own credit and paralyze its own economic resources.
- C. There already exists today a working machinery in the interests of international peace.
 - 1. The last ten years have seen the creation of
 - a. The League of Nations.
 - b. The World Court.
 - c. The Locarno treaties.
 - 2. We are learning every day more and more how to use them.
 - a. The most recent addition to our machinery of international peace is the Kellogg peace pact.
 - (1) In this pact fifty-four great nations of the world agree to abolish war as an instrument of national policy.
 - (2) There is no reason why it cannot be made to work.
- D. Another factor toward peace is what Nicholas Murray Butler terms the "growth of the international mind."

1. It is a new spirit of good will and mutual esteem among the peoples of the world.
 2. It is a desire for world welfare that takes the place of patriotism.
- II. Arbitration will be necessary to save the world against destruction by future wars.
 - A. Another great war would cause our present economic system to collapse completely.
 1. War debts are too tremendous.
 - a. The Civil War debt has never yet been paid and probably never will be.
 - b. The direct and indirect costs of the World War in money and men are almost beyond calculation.
 - (1) No nation has paid its war debt, and it never will.
 2. The cost of continual preparation for war, even in times of peace, is staggering.
 - B. War takes the best part of the population and returns them, if at all, physical wrecks.
 1. It leaves nations with people impoverished both physically and mentally.
 - a. Spain paid for 300 years for her 50 years' mastery of the world.
 - C. The methods used in future wars will mean the inevitable destruction of civilization.
 1. Gas and airplanes will replace our present armies and navies.
 - a. General John Fries, head of the Chemical Warfare Service, says that the use of gas in the last war was a farce compared to what it will be in the future.
 2. With these methods cities or communities can be annihilated in a single night.
 - a. No effective resistance or protection against attack can be provided for.
 - b. Non-combatants, including women and children, will be the first to go.
- III. Arbitration has already been used successfully to prevent war.
 - A. The Alabama claims, and Venezuela case, were settled by arbitration.

NEGATIVE

INTRODUCTION :

- A. By "arbitration" the negative mean
 - 1. The reference of a dispute to a third party for decision, together with an undertaking by both parties to carry out that decision.
- B. "Settlement by arbitration" implies the carrying out of that decision.
- C. The word "can" in the motion means that the question must be considered in the light of present day conditions.
 - 1. If arbitration can settle all international disputes it would be a guaranty of peace.
 - 2. But we still have armaments.
- I. We have no reason for thinking that arbitration will be successful.
 - A. It has not been successful in the past.
 - 1. According to Bryce it has settled only one of seventeen major wars that have occurred during the past one hundred years.
 - a. That was the Boer War between England and the Transvaal.
 - B. Public opinion is not capable of forming a correct opinion on matters of dispute between nations.
 - 1. We do not yet know what was responsible for the World War.
 - C. The fact that 90 per cent of the nations may think war a horrible thing will not prevent the 10 per cent from going to war if they think they can profit by it.
 - D. No practical means exist by which arbitration may be carried out.
 - 1. The only treaties that exist between nations are the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Kellogg Pact.
 - a. As far as prevention of war is concerned the Covenant of the League of Nations is open to question.
 - (1) It permits war under certain conditions.
 - (2) It admits that arbitration in itself is no guaranty of peace.

- (a) It sanctions the use of arms and economic boycott to enforce decisions.
 - (3) The United States and Russia are not members.
 - b. The Kellogg Pact has failed.
 - (1) China and Russia made terms only after they had had a fight which was practically war.
 - 2. Treaties of arbitration are no more effective than any other treaties.
 - a. Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, a member of Great Britain's Labor Party, says
 - (1) "There is no nation which has not been guilty of breaking a treaty when the occasion demanded it."
 - b. Even the United States, on one occasion, after agreeing to go to arbitration and presenting the facts to the chosen tribunal, refused to carry out the tribunal's decision.
 - c. It is the possibility of a nation's being able, with the the approval of public opinion, to disregard decisions that causes nations to keep their armies and navies.
- II. Before arbitration can be of value we must destroy the old imperialistic and nationalistic fears, hatreds, passions and prejudices.
- A. These exist today in their full strength.
 - 1. The larger part of mankind is ruled by its feelings and not by reason.
 - a. Even civilized nations, like England or Germany or France, believe in their superiority or are in mortal fear of one another.
 - 2. The spirit of nationalism is still strong.
 - a. The threat of a war scare between Great Britain and Turkey brought instant promise from the colonies of support in case of war.
 - b. The United States has the support of most of its people in keeping its marines in Nicaragua.

- c. People in the United States and Great Britain upheld the presence of their warships and battles in China.
 - (1) These countries had economic interests there.
 - 3. There is still present in the world a great deal of national ill-will.
 - a. The Germans and the French hate and fear each other.
 - b. The treaty of Versailles set the stage for another long series of struggles.
 - (1) Some states regard the maintenance of present arrangements as essential in their national policy.
 - (2) Other nations regard the Versailles agreement as something that cannot remain unchanged.
 - 4. America and Australia would fight rather than submit to arbitration on their race problems.
 - a. It is not likely that America would submit to arbitration on liberating the Filipinos.
 - B. Until all nations realize that their own self-expression can be enjoyed without detriment to their neighbors, it will be impossible to settle all disputes by arbitration.
- III. Intervention will be a more effective means than arbitration in settling international disputes.
- A. The dispute between Chile and Peru was settled by the states of America by means of intervention and not arbitration.
 - 1. It was not the reference of the dispute to a third party for decision, but the effort of a stronger power to force peace on the parties.
 - B. The League of Nations works thru intervention and not arbitration.
 - 1. It forced hostilities to cease on the Greek-Bulgarian front in 1925.
 - a. It forced the parties to accept the report of the League's Commission of Inquiry.
 - C. There should be a world court powerful enough to enforce its judgments upon belligerent nations and so maintain peace.

1. The plan for such a scheme will be put before the League of Nations in the next few months.
 - a. It will imply an airplane force speedy and powerful enough to subdue any nation that threatens the peace of the world.
 - b. It will make disarmament among the nations possible.

ARBITRATION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

versus

VICTORIA COLLEGE OF NEW ZEALAND
UNIVERSITY

CHAIRMAN—The question under consideration tonight is whether all matters of international dispute can be settled by arbitration. Columbia College will uphold the Affirmative and Victoria College of New Zealand University the Negative of this question. The first speaker for the Affirmative will be Mr. Lawrence T. Schwarz of the class of 1930.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Lawrence T. Schwarz, Columbia

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN: I indeed consider it a great personal pleasure to welcome the men from Victoria College of New Zealand University. This is the first time in the history of Columbia debating that a New Zealand team has visited us, and it is an unusually opportune time since the question raised for discussion is at present before the minds of the peoples of the world.

The German poet and philosopher, Goethe, remarked that the public opinion of any people is continually being expressed by its drama and literature. Applying the words of the great German Romanticist to our own times, let us open the doors of our theatres and scan the pages of our books to find what is therein contained. At the Henry Miller theatre in New York appears a play called *Journey's End*. No doubt many of you have seen it,

for the play has run for over six months and played nightly to capacity houses. It is a realistic picture of the front trench life of English officers. In the field of literature, Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*, a love story of the war, is one of the current best sellers. Emil Ludwig's recent work, *July 1914*, dealing with the causes of the war and attempting to fix the blame, has won universal popularity almost simultaneously with its date of publication. But the book read most widely, that has been translated into nineteen different languages, that has reached a circulation of over two million copies, is the German war novel, *Im Westen Nichts Neues*, that we know in the English as *All Quiet on the Western Front*. It is the work of Erich Maria Remarque, a Frenchman by birth, though a German by environment, education and culture.

This present literature and drama sees war as something terrible, ugly, devastating and barbarous. There is no hero worship, no enemy to be vanquished unless it be the arch enemy war, itself; no victory for the victor, no special suffering for the conquered. All suffer alike. No enemies on either side, just human beings hurled into the maelstrom. It sees man as a being who fights, yes fights because reason has left him, fights because he is mad.

Such is the picture of war literature gives us today. Different from what we saw or were made to see in 1916-1917? Rather! *All Quiet on the Western Front* would have been scoffed at then. It would have been hurled aside as the work of an insane pacifist. What were we reading during those eventful years? Why we read such books as Arthur Guy Empey's *Over The Top* and his *First Call*. We thrilled at such stuff and called it heroic, patriotic, redblooded. Let me contrast a passage from Empey with a passage from Remarque. In an appeal for American sympathy, Empey has this to say:

We are at war with Germany, not only Prussianism, but with the *German people* and *everything connected with Germany*. The trenches are manned by the *German people*; Prussianism and militarism are supported by the *German people*; *German people* are sinking our ships, killing our boys, and bombing our hospitals. Is Uncle Sam going to sit idly by while all this is going on? Not likely, it's against the old boy's nature. So up and at them, America!

And America went "over the top!" But, when it got there, it was not greeted by a picture of glory as Empey painted, but it

rather met a scene of realism, of horror such as Remarque describes:

We see men living with their skulls blown open; we see soldiers run with their two feet cut off, they stagger on their splintered stumps into the next shell-hole; a lance corporal crawls a mile and a half on his hands dragging his smashed knee after him; another goes to the dressing station and over his clasped hands bulge his intestines; we see men without mouths, without jaws, without faces; we find one man who has held the artery of his arm in his teeth for two hours in order not to bleed to death.

Eleven years have brought a change. Eleven years since that memorable eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month when the world was hushed and peace came. Eleven years have brought a change, indeed! Who would dare to exit after the final curtain of *Journey's End*, saying "Let's have another war!" Who would dare to close a copy of *All Quiet on the Western Front*, crying "Give me the chance to fight for my Fatherland!"

The words of Goethe are as true today as when he first uttered them. The opinion of the peoples of the world today is for peace! No one dare contradict this. The world went to war because it had no way of avoiding war and settling its controversies peacefully. It wants no more of war! It is ready to accept any substitute for war, provided that substitute is practical and can be made to work.

We of the Affirmative are here this evening to propose arbitration as the substitute for war. We are not championing any special form of past arbitration such as the League of Nations Pact, or the present Kellogg Peace Pact, but rather we are championing the general principle of arbitration as an instrument of international justice that can peacefully and rationally settle controversies between nations.

I have sketched for you the present attitude of public opinion which is for peace. It is interesting to notice that along with this attitude there has developed a gradual disappearance of those factors that have been instrumental in bringing about wars in the past. Along with the disappearance of the past causes of war there is developing a strong international mind both here and abroad, and the pattern necessary for successful international arbitration is fast being woven into the fabric of international law and international relations.

If I were to ask any of you to mention the chief cause of war in the past, you would unhesitatingly say nationalism and national honor. Ever since the Middle Ages and the Crusades saw the seed of nationalism planted in the soil of Europe, ever since the War of the Roses saw an England emerge from a heterogeneous group of baronies, ever since a Cardinal Richelieu guided the hand of a French monarchy, nationalism has been the fagot that has intermittently lighted the fires of war. My opponents may argue that the peace treaty at Versailles in 1919 developed more national states than existed before the World War. Quite true. The plains of Austria Hungary have been divided into several national states which before the war existed as suppressed nationalities. There is an increase in the number of distinct nationalities but the nationalistic spirit found before the war is on the wane. Economic enterprises are developing an international significance. Such things as German neo-mercantilism which manifested such great strength before the war are no more. Disarmament is being preached everywhere. The world's leaders are internationally minded.

In the past, large armies and navies have always been a potential cause of war. So long as nations have the proper armaments and are prepared for war there is no reason why they cannot go to war at a moment's notice. Remove large armies and you will force nations to use rational and peaceful means in settling controversies. There is at present a strong movement on foot for disarmament. Let me quote from Guglielmo Ferrero, the foremost contemporary historian in Italy and one of the greatest historians in the world. The following is from an essay of his which recently appeared in a New York newspaper:

Times have changed. A serious attempt for disarmament and for peace should have positive and important results.

In Europe the masses are beginning to understand that to arm is to render war certain. The masses desire peace. No one dare contradict this.

What has the World War demonstrated? That war with modern armies and modern weapons ruins the victor as well as the vanquished; that there is no longer any proportion between the sacrifices of money and blood it imposes and the political interests it is called to defend; that for every question which war solves well or ill, it creates two or more difficult ones.

The World War resolved the questions of Alsace-Lorraine and of Poland, but created the questions of Danzig, of Silesia, of Hungary, of Russia, of Palestine, of Egypt, of Iraq; the

question of minorities, the question of the seas, the question of debts, the question of reparations.

War no longer serves.

In January of the coming year the principal nations of the world are to meet in an international disarmament conference. Their chances for establishing a sound system of disarmament seem exceptionally bright, especially if we consider the pressure of public opinion in the world today for peace and disarmament.

In the past wars were often caused thru the existence of important national figures. A Cardinal Richelieu, recently styled "the Father of Nationalism" by Hilaire Belloc, made a Louis XIV, and thru foreign intrigues and wars established a powerful France. A Bismarck with his ambitions of spreading "Die Deutsche Kultur," a Bismarck with his policy of "Blut und Eisen," brought about the bloody Franco-Prussian struggle so that a unified Germany might be possible where before existed a group of heterogeneous states. Garibaldi and his "Red Shirts" did not even respect the dignity of the Cloth and the Crosier in his mad attempt to snatch Rome and add it to the fast forming Italian nationality.

These nationalistic figures are not prominent today because the world is showing a strong international attitude. In Russia just recently we have an instance of a Soviet regime that prevented a war with China because it realized the futility of war and the greater efficacy of arbitration. It is true that in Italy Mussolini exists as an ardent nationalist and his desire is to see a strong Italy, a nationalistic Italy. However, his ambitions are curbed, curbed internally by Italian diplomats and externally by an internationally inclined world. If Mussolini, in his present capacity, existed in 1910-1912, he would have surely plunged Italy into war. Clemenceau, the tiger of France, Clemenceau, the nationalist is dead. France is at last free to work out its future destiny along internationalistic lines. In England, Premier MacDonald, a member of the labor party, is preaching peace, arbitration, disarmament, and international goodwill. His views are strongly being indorsed and advocated by President Hoover here in America.

The world is changing. Public opinion is internationally minded. The past causes of war are being outlawed. The spirit of the drama *Journey's End* and the novel *All Quiet on the Western Front* is the spirit of mankind.. The world is ripe for arbitration.

FIRST NEGATIVE

Guy R. Powles, Victoria

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN: Before joining issue with my friend who has just sat down I would like to thank him very much indeed for his kind words of welcome to ourselves. It is indeed a great privilege for us to be debating with a college of such international reputation as Columbia, and coming as it does at the end of our tour we regard it as the culminating point. We have been to a number of colleges in America and are convinced from what we have seen of the feeling between Americans and English, that the wordy battles that we have been waging are the only kind of battles that will ever be waged between the English speaking races.

I am afraid that my friend has suffered from the great evil which affects most of the advocates of the cause which he has been advocating this evening. And when I say this I don't want you to think for a moment we don't desire peace for we do. And he has quite properly read to you some of the horrors of war, and I think that to our country of New Zealand these have been brought home more closely than to the United States. We hope that we may never have another war. We pray we may never have another war, but nevertheless I fear my friend has been carried away on the wings of desire and has failed to see facts as they are. Surely it is only by the clear facing of facts that we can come to a clear conclusion. Therefore I should like to tie him down so that we can come to such a conclusion on the matter of this debate.

We refer in the debate, in the first place, to "arbitration." "Arbitration" means the reference of a dispute to a third party for decision together with an undertaking by both parties to carry out that decision. "Settlement by arbitration" implies the carrying out of that decision. Also, in the motion is the verb "can," and that word is in the present tense. That means that when we are discussing this problem we must discuss it in the light of present day conditions and present day problems, and then see whether the motion applies. And further, only "arbitration" is mentioned in the motion, and I am very much afraid that many in the school of thought represented by my friend when they say "arbitration" may mean several different things and

then talk loosely about "arbitration." They may do more harm than good, because if international disputes may be settled by the culmination of a number of means, arbitration being one of them, then it is not open to my friend to say they have been settled by arbitration.

He has in the course of his speech given three of the main causes of war, and I quite agree that those are some of the main causes of wars; but to be a little more precise in the meaning of terms I should like to suggest that, after all, the causes of war are always an unsettled international dispute, and if arbitration can settle all international disputes, then it can remove all causes of war. Therefore arbitration provides a guaranty for the peace of the world. And when we have tied him down to logic it will appear that his position is not quite so sound as it might at first appear. If arbitration provides a guaranty for peace, surely there is at the present time some flaw somewhere—why armaments?

I should like for a short time to consider the history of arbitration. During the last hundred years there have been seventeen major wars, and of those only one arose from a cause which could have been settled by arbitration. I have to make that statement without offering proof because obviously I cannot in the time allotted to me give the causes of all the seventeen wars, but I make it on the authority of the late Viscount Bryce. The one war was the Boer War between England and the Transvaal, and that is the only war that arose from a dispute which could have been settled by arbitration. Let us take some examples of the others—say the Franco-Prussian War. Does any student of history say that could have been settled by arbitration? Again, the Balkan Wars, 1912-1917. Again, Italy and Turkey in 1909—imperialistic ambitions on the part of Turkey. Again we see arbitration would have had no affect. I know what my friend there will say, "O yes, that was a long time ago. Conditions have changed." Indeed they have, and I know we are all pleased to see what great progress internationalism has made, but the cause of international peace can be done more harm than good by thinking in a loose fashion.

My colleagues will show you that the change has not perhaps been quite so great as my opponents would indicate. Let us examine what are the present prospects of an arbitration treaty. In the first place my friend said there was a tremendous im-

provement in international morality, therefore international morality at the present time was strong enough to prevent war. Now let us see what this involves. In the first place it involves the proposition that the world, or the world which is expressing itself in dispute, is capable of forming a correct opinion on matters of dispute between nations. I believe it is true that public opinion is correctly formed on matters of principle, but when it comes to the application of principles to facts we find a vast difference. My friend has told you about that wonderful book of Ludwig's in which he attempts to fix the blame for the World War. Why even now, fifteen years after the outbreak of that war, we do not know who was responsible. We cannot even yet apply principles to the 1914 facts—when we do so we are hopelessly lost. Have we any reason to suppose that, if any of those facts occurred now as in 1914, we should, or any tribunal would be able to come to a correct decision concerning them?

Then, secondly, that proposition of his that international morality has grown to such extent as to prevent war involves also that such an opinion when focused and expressed, provided it is focused and expressed, will be sufficient sanction to prevent war. He has forgotten that 90 per cent of the nations may think war a horrible thing. That may not prevent the 10 per cent from going to war if it thinks it can get anything out of it. You know it is said in the Old Book, "There is not one of the nations that doeth righteousness, no not one." And I am afraid that is still true. Those two reasons appear to be disproved.

If I would develop that line of argument further I would have to consider what prospects arbitration has so far as treaties are concerned. Suppose a dispute arise, how could it be settled by arbitration? No treaty exists among nations of the earth. There are two important documents, the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Kellogg Pact. The Covenant of the League of Nations is peculiar and involved. It would take too long to elaborate its principles in detail, but so far as prevention of war is concerned it is open to question. That is to say war is allowed in certain events. And in the second place, those framers of the Covenant of the League of Nations admitted that arbitration in itself was no guaranty of peace, so they provided for certain sanctions for the enforcement of decisions; for instance, the use of armed force. That principle is practically

relegated to the background, as was admitted by the author of the Bok peace plan in 1924. A second one was that of an economic boycott. Economists believe it to be quite a useless weapon, because of the grouping of nations into economic groups and also because of the great difficulty in enforcing it; so the League of Nations does not appear to offer us very great help. The greatest obstacles to its success perhaps are that Russia and the United States are not members.

Now the Kellogg Pact. I will have to touch on this briefly. I know it represents advanced international thought, but it has signally failed. My friend says, look at China and Russia. But do you know that they had their war, and then they said "We will settle the matter now that we have had our fight?" Manchuria was forced to make terms after a fight, which was nothing less than a war. There were heavy casualties on both sides, villages destroyed, they had all the usual concomitants of war, and now they say they will go back practically to status quo. And then my friend says that that dispute has been settled by arbitration.

After all treaties of arbitration have no more effect than any other treaties. Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, one of the most influential members of the Labor Party in Great Britain today, once said:

There is no nation which has not been guilty of breaking a treaty when the occasion demanded it.

He may perhaps have had in mind the occasion when the United States after agreeing to go to arbitration and presenting the facts before the tribunal refused to carry out the tribunal's decision. That was some time ago, but nevertheless it actually occurred.

Further, I should like to finish with a quotation from a speech made by Mr. Holls, who was the representative of the United States at the Hague Conference in 1899, thirty years ago. He said this:

The formulating of the ideas of mediation and good offices, of arbitration, of international commissions of inquiry, and of procedure before courts of arbitration is in itself a work of no small importance—it will not prevent war where the question at issue is of such grave importance that the government can, with the full approval of public opinion, disregard all the machinery which we have provided for its peaceful adjustment.

That is the whole question. In nine cases out of ten possibly arbitration will settle the dispute, but in the tenth case it will not, and it is against the possibility of the tenth case occurring that nations keep their armaments. Their obvious reluctance to reduce them shows that they regard such a possibility as by no means a remote one.

It is therefore begging the question to say that all international disputes can be settled by arbitration. Thank you.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Arthur B. Krim, Columbia

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Mr. Powles reminds me of a speaker we had at Columbia several years ago. He would sit behind his table, while one of the gentlemen on the opposing team was speaking, with an imposing stack of cards in front of him. As the gentleman would present a point, he would single out a card, write out the point mentioned, glance at it very appraisingly, and then carefully lay it down. Nine times out of ten the audience would be watching him instead of the speaker. Finally, when it was his turn to speak, he would ask the audience what the gentleman had said. In answer, he would single out one of the cards, read the statement on it with a note of sustained triumph, and then very calmly tear the card up. When he had all the pieces of his opponent's arguments carefully stacked in a corner of the rostrum, he would go on to the rest of his speech, leaving the audience under the impression that he had very capably refuted all the points on the other side.

I bring this up now because the first speaker from New Zealand has confidently told you that I will say, "Why, Ladies and Gentlemen, these wars my friend speaks of happened a long time ago. Today, conditions have changed." It is true that this is our contention this evening, and I fail to see that this flourishing statement does anything to weaken it. It is our firm belief that if we take the forces in the world at present as any indication of where the world is going, we have every reason to believe that all international disputes will in the future be settled in peace.

If the question were worded, "resolved that all love be abolished, or resolved that all fear be abolished," then there most surely would be some justification for the viewpoint of the last speaker, because it is agreed that there is something fundamental about the formation of things that would make the abolition of love or of fear impossible. But I fail to see that the same is true of war. I fail to believe that there is some inherent characteristic of our civilization which forces men to go into laboratories, concoct poison gases, and use them on the battlefield. I fail to believe that there is some inherent characteristic of our civilization which forces men to sacrifice others for their economic and nationalistic ends. And until these gentlemen offer us some one reason, beyond the fact that it has been true of the past, why certain international disputes must inevitably be settled thru the medium of the battlefield, we will feel ourselves secure in our position this evening.

The last speaker has mentioned seventeen wars, each fought for economic and imperialistic reasons. It is true that past wars have been fought in the main over disputes of this character, but it is doubtful whether this will be true of the future. We have only to look to the situation of both parties at the end of the Great War to realize that whatever economic profits, if any, will be wrung out of the death and misery of a future war will weigh but as dust in the balance. But even economic profits will be lacking in the next war. We live today in a world that has grown. Every nation, as we learned from the World War, has the roots of its prosperity interlaced with those of its neighbors. With our great international holding companies and capital as mobile as it is, a nation by entering a future war would do no more than ruin its own shipping, destroy its own credit, and in general paralyze its whole economic situation. The time has passed when a nation can bombard its neighbor and then monopolize its economic advantages. That was all very well when warfare was no more than a duelling match, but the "Big Berthas," tanks, and aeroplanes make war today far more than that. The countries of the world realize this. That is why we have peace pacts today pledging the abolition of war as a means of attaining national ends, and that is why we feel that there is no economic or imperialistic problem of the future which will not be settled by arbitration.

Our first speaker, Mr. Schwarz, has suggested that when we look to the past causes of war, we see that there is no one of

them which is the driving force of some inevitable militarism. Nationalism, armaments, dictators, none of these, as he has shown, mean that war is the inevitable, the inescapable method of solving disputes. I submit that the same is true of the causes of the wars mentioned by the gentleman from New Zealand. There are reasons, economic and moral, reasons touching on the progress of the world, why the fact that these disputes have led to war in the past is no indication that they will do so in the future.

And so, rather than abandoning my position as a result of what has been said on the other side of this question, I should like to reassert why we of Columbia feel justified in upholding our side of this question without being accused of undue optimism. The reason closest to each of us has already been suggested to you, but it can hardly be overemphasized. The world today is filled with a more profound hatred of war than ever before. The men who came back from the World War didn't come back swashbuckling militarists. They didn't come back glorifying their success, but rather with a realization that peace must be had at any sacrifice. There's Timothy Murphy, for instance, who enlisted to fight for the glory of the Crown as soon as he was old enough to shoulder a gun. Still when he spoke to us down here on Ninety-first Street a few weeks ago, I assure you it was not the glory of the Crown he told us about. He told us instead how he completed his service and came home from the World War a wreck. He told us how he lined up with the other wrecks to march on to the palace of the king he had protected. He told us how the people cheered and the bands played. "And do you think they played 'God save Murphy'?" he asked us. "They did not! They played 'God save the king,' and if anybody needed saving it was poor old Timothy Murphy."

There are countless "Timothy Murphys" about us today telling what the last war meant to them and what another war will necessarily mean. Why, men who at the beginning of the war felt that they would gladly give up their lives for their generals and captains were at the end advocating armies composed only of officers because they would probably never get near enough to hurt each other. The lessons in *All Quiet on the Western Front* and other war literature speak of the ruin of a whole generation and warn against the ruin of another. I warrant that every member of this audience is filled with a passionate hatred

of war, and would revolt at the idea of anybody coming out coldly in favor of it. Remember that this is true of the whole civilized world today. The peoples of the world today fervently desire peace, and that is the healthiest of all signs that can be had.

But the hatred of war is not the sole reason for our optimism this evening. Contrary to the opinions of the last speaker, we have today a working machinery in the interests of international peace, developed to a greater extent than we ourselves realize. The arbitration of international disputes is no longer some far off ideal. During the past few years nations have shown for the first time an unparalleled desire to find ways and means of enforcing arbitration under compulsion. The last ten years alone have seen the creation of the League of Nations, the World Court, the adoption of the Locarno Treaties, each of these marking the phenomenal and practical progress of the world toward the abolition of unjustifiable war. The League of Nations, in itself, despite Mr. Powles's derogatory remarks, has had a success in its efforts toward international cooperation which would have seemed fantastical to the statesmen of a few centuries back. The machinery of the World Court, in spite of Mr. Powles's remarks, is progressive. It represents an improvement on the original Hague Court of Arbitration, which shows how far nearer to peace the world is today than ever before.

More important, however, than the possession of these institutions is the fact that every day we are learning more how to use them. A few months ago, for instance, we included as the most recent part of our machinery of international obligations, the already referred to Kellogg Pact. In this pact the fifty-four great nations of the world agree to abolish war as an instrument of national policy and to settle all questions of international difficulty peacefully. This pact therefore puts into a morally binding document, what the whole world has come to believe. In a sense the whole issue in dispute tonight turns upon the question: Can a pact of this sort be enforced? Will it work? We fail to see why it will not. If backed by the full momentum of the public hatred of war, this pact will necessarily be enforced. If in the past public opinion has influenced nations to fight for national honor, we have every reason to believe that in the future public opinion will influence nations that there can be no greater breach of national honor than the fail-

ure to live up to one's signed agreement to abolish war. The task now is to perfect the machinery for making the pact effective. All that is needed is a readiness to use it in whole-hearted cooperation with the instruments of international policy already at work—the League of Nations and the World Court. With the past causes of war fast losing their military proportions, there is no reason why this pact should not be developed into more than a moral agreement, into a binding contract. There is no reason why once the nations have learned how to use it the world should not be rid of the outbreak of any hostilities whatsoever under the penalty of international coercion and international boycott. With all our hatred of war and with all the machinery of international justice already at our command, it seems a contradiction in itself that we must continually be told that there must be war, that it is an inescapable evil.

One thing more. There is another growth in our modern civilization, less tangible perhaps, but more important in a sense than all these others put together. It is what Nicholas Murray Butler has been pleased to term the "growth of the international mind," the new desire for international cooperation that we see manifest in the treaties to abolish war, the new spirit of good will and mutual esteem amongst the peoples of the world. The value of all this is immeasurable, and that it is present today to a greater extent than ever before is undeniable. Without it, our pacts to arbitrate might well go up in smoke, but with it they may very well be successful. When this desire for the welfare of the world takes the place of patriotism, as it will, war will have to be outlawed in response to the public opinion of the world. Surely you gentlemen from New Zealand, in your tour thru America, have discovered none of the latent belligerence which a nation must have if you are to support your side of the proposition this evening. Surely, you have found something more to the American mind than the desire to make profits and collect war debts. You have certainly seen here a good will and a desire for international peace which will parallel anything in the world. I am sure that this has already come to mean more to you than all the propaganda of our Shearers and our navy building steel merchants abroad. Take the reception given the Prime Minister of your Mother Country when he came to America. Good will! When Ramsay MacDonald spoke to us, he did more for mutual understanding between our two na-

tions than all the stately minuets of pre-war diplomacy put together. And our tribute to him was not only the tribute to a great man. It was the tribute of millions of people to learn that the cause of peace which he advocated was your cause as well as ours. We are not here to dogmatically assert that there will be no more war, but it isn't often that nations have been able to talk to each other as America and England have been doing these past few weeks. And while we will not look for a new universe as a result of a few sincere speeches, still these evidences of a spirit of mutual trust between nations, these evidences of the growth of an international outlook, are signs that point to release from war. They indicate to us that the world has reached the point where it is ready to substitute arbitration for high explosives as the means of solving the problems of world politics. Thank you.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Walter Hall, Victoria

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN: The last speaker attempted to show that war will not take place in the future. I am afraid he did not really touch the motion which you may remember is that all international disputes can be settled by arbitration. War appears to be one way of attempting to settle these international disputes. Disputes will occur which cannot be settled, which nations will decide to leave unsettled. War will not necessarily occur. Our friends are in a difficult position, because they have to prove that all international disputes can be settled by arbitration. They must realize that, in the first place, they have either to show that the causes which have been laid to the arising of disputes in the past which could not be settled by means of arbitration have now passed, or else that, while those causes remain, there is machinery for the settlement of international disputes and, at the same time, the desire and the will and the ability on the part of every nation to settle all disputes thru those channels. You realize what a difficult position they are in, having to prove this position.

Just before I touch the main matters of my speech I want to read one or two excerpts from the press. The first one is taken from the *Daily News* of New York. Here it is.

Our country in her intercourse with foreign nations—may she always be in the right, but our country, right or wrong.

Another quotation from the New York press. This refers to the joy of the Rhineland inhabitants as the French and Americans leave.

Within a few hours lists of crimes committed by the troops of occupation were posted. Troops which have been prohibited by the treaty of Versailles marched thru the streets and were cheered by the populace; veterans of the World War marched side by side reviewing all the dazzling splendor of military pomp. Von Mackensen, who was cheered to the echo, spoke of the day of retribution, when the indignation of the Treaty of Versailles would be avenged and the hall rang with "Hochs" for the Kaiser.

And now I must read an excerpt from Ramsay MacDonald's speech.

We shall never be able to effect physical disarmament until we have succeeded in effecting moral disarmament.

People don't fight for the reasons they give for it after they have got into the war; they fight because something has happened; because a train of circumstances has happened that puts their nerves on edge which makes them unhappy in their suspicions; which makes them feel unsafe and insecure until by a continuation of that mentality they come to the conclusion.

And, if those things still are in existence which cause that fear, that hatred, that causation of circumstances which lead up to this final conclusion, it is useless to say that all disputes can be settled by arbitration. I will say, just here, that arbitration is a sound way of settling disputes. I want to see them settled by arbitration, but am convinced before arbitration, alone, will be of value, we must destroy the old imperialistic and nationalistic fears, hatreds, prejudices, and passions which our friends have the temerity to say do not exist. I say they exist today with all the strength of previous time, and it is because of those nationalistic passions, the belief in a chosen people, in Kultur, in the policy of the mailed fist, that Britannia rules the waves, the belief in a harsh imperialism, and the idea that one nation can, and should, gain for itself at the expense of other nations, that it is impossible for arbitration, alone, to settle international difficulties. I think we all realize that the problem is chiefly psychological. Would it be fair to say that mankind can always act by the light of reason? I submit it would not for the simple reason that men are not masters of themselves. The

same thing applies to all nations. I trust the time will come when these disputes will be settled by arbitration, but at present this cannot be. We find over a vast area of the earth's surface people, who as Nansen has said, are not educated, are really beasts of prey, people who have little knowledge, little understanding. And then we come to the so-called civilized nations. We think of Germany and France, the latter, at any rate, armed to the teeth. A few years ago, when in New Zealand, I wrote to a Frenchman. I was trying to get some insight into the French idea, and he explained to me that his grandfather had been killed in a war with Germany, that his father had been killed in a war with Germany, and that he, himself, had been injured nigh to death in the last Great War. France has been, and still is, in mortal fear of her neighbor, and yet the Affirmative tell us that nationalistic passions do not exist. I trust I may be able to sympathize with German nationalism, but I submit that until all nations realize that their own self expression can be enjoyed without detriment to their neighbor's and that they can secure for themselves and for their people, happiness and prosperity, without disturbing the safety and assurance of other nations, it will be impossible to settle all disputes by arbitration.

I want to say just here that it is a great pleasure to debate this subject in a university which, I believe, is as far forward as any in the world in promoting international good will. I believe in all these movements within the university, and I believe in the ideals of such men as Ramsay MacDonald and the late President Wilson. I believe in them with all my heart just as I believe in the Locarno Treaty and the Kellogg Pact. I believe that all these instruments are having a good effect upon governments and peoples, and by means of them the people are, to some extent, being made to see that international good will depends not upon allowing things to drift, but upon extending the hand of good will and clasping it, extending the hand of good will to peoples of all nations.

I know very well that the last war was a terrible thing. On the other side of the world we saw our troop ships leave, and saw our wounded return, and we have not forgotten it. If we can do anything to avert such a terrible catastrophe as took place in 1914 we shall do it, but let us realize the facts, and the facts are that until we have a completely educated democracy in

every country, and until that democracy is educated to the point where it is prepared to express a determination that arbitration alone shall be used between nations, and until there is a definite will for peace thruout the entire world, arbitration, alone, will be of no use.

I wish now, Mr. Chairman, to read this taken from the *London Spectator*. It is from the pen of a man named F. Yeats Brown, and it sums up very clearly some of the psychological causes of war. He says:

Is it not the truth that the plain sensible men and women of every nation, while disliking bloodshed, felt that the Great war was inevitable? Wars and their causes can be explained only by psychology. Newspapers and Parliaments more than ever reflect the mind of the man in the street. We are governed as we desire, read the news the majority of us demand, fight the wars we want.

International instruments do not, of themselves, bring peace; they have to be vitalized by the human spirit. Instinct is dynamite. The atavisms we all nurse in the nebulous region which is seven-eighths of our mental make-up are still capable of blowing civilization skyhigh. Rumor may release the furies of hell. And if we seek to suppress conflict instead of sublimating it, we sow dragons' teeth.

You see that it is a plea, not for international arbitration, it is a plea that people definitely establish good will. It is a thing of the spirit. It depends upon education in the schools, the churches, the efforts of statesmen, and until it is shown that there is good will thruout the entire world it is useless to say that all nations will be bound by what have, in the past, been regarded as scraps of paper.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

John Burke, Columbia

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We have heard the speakers from New Zealand concerning the causes of war and the question whether the problems of the world can be solved by arbitration. We have endeavored to show that the nations of the world and their rulers realize that arbitration is not a vague hope but a vivid actuality. The gentlemen from New Zealand have cited many wars, seventeen in the last hundred years and

they claim that only one—the Boer War—could have been settled by arbitration. With this I must differ. I claim that all wars are basically economic in character and that all can be settled by arbitration. They have spoken among other wars of that between Italy and Turkey. Yet it was only yesterday that the *Times* announced that these two nations both imperialistic and warlike in character had agreed to allow the World Court to settle the disputed ownership of seventeen islands in the Aegean. This, My Friends, is practical arbitration.

The scholars of the world have claimed that nationalism no longer corresponds to the actual facts of life; economically and culturally men are world-citizens; only politically are they national, because juridical ideas have fallen behind the facts. Nationalism is so general because it has been emphasized in the teaching of history; for this is devoted almost exclusively to political affairs, which are chiefly national, and hence is oblivious of the great international tendencies in all other fields.

This is our claim—that the condition of the world since the War has changed and is changing—that the ideas of peoples have changed—that no longer is arbitration met by the handicaps it was once faced with. War is economic and the economic struggle of the world is now between individuals of competing trades not nations: If we want to sell harvesters to Argentina, we should be glad to have Europe buy her wheat; and if Europe is to buy her wheat, Europeans must sell something in some foreign market wherewith to get the money and so become our competitors somewhere. A market is not a place where things are sold; it is a place where things are bought and sold; and the one operation is impossible without the other, a fact which makes our competitors necessary to our markets and our markets impossible without our competitors. America is no more a rival of Britain or Germany than Virginia is a rival of Missouri.

No longer can nations of the world hope to gain booty from a great imperialistic struggle. It is doubtful whether the credit of a defeated country, devastated, deprived of its trade and normal industry could be made to yield the enormous sums expended in its conquest. Even in 1870 Prussia ultimately lost more by her victory than she gained and the nations of the world realize this.

Peru and Chile, not long ago, under the pressure of the nations of this hemisphere were forced to arbitrate their prob-

lems rather than indulge in a costly war—another triumph for arbitration forced by economic means upon two unwilling nations. As we suspected, my opponents have brought up the late disturbance between China and Russia. Here there has been more than a partial victory for arbitration, for both countries wished war—Russia desiring fanatically to spread her doctrines by arms and China with huge armies, difficult to disband save after a successful war. Both these nations desired war and outwardly refused to arbitrate yet the economic pressure was so great upon them that they were forced against their will to stop war—another victory for that economic arbitration which my opponents claim is not feasible. Nations are nowadays as individuals of the great world state and they have given up under economic pressure certain rights which, in a frontier community, an individual possesses. Any citizen may say, "True, I limit my personal liberty and divest myself of a right when I agree not to shoot off a revolver on the streets whenever I feel like it. But in submitting to this restriction—which an American frontiersman will not tolerate—I secure the advantage over him that I am safer on the streets than he, since my fellow-citizens may not shoot either."

The other members of my team have cited three reasons for the increasing effectiveness of arbitration as a means of settling all world disputes.

First, that the public opinion of the world is now aroused against war as never before—that feeling which our President of Columbia called "the growth of the international mind."

Second, that the causes of war are upon the wane, that economically the world has a different outlook than it had only a short time ago. As one of Henry Ford's economists so ably claimed, "It has become a truism to say that modern war is almost wholly economic in its origin. This is true not only of international war but of internal revolution. Where nations have no economic rivalries, it is almost impossible to stir up a war between them. They may have different religions, different racial origin and different social, moral and political traditions; but each nation will be content to let the other go its way until it begins to suspect that the other's course is somehow menacing its own material prosperity."

Third, the machinery of arbitration—and by arbitration we mean any force, judicial, economic or political, that may stop

war—is now placed upon a working basis and we may look forward to a rapid increase in effectiveness until it is able to meet any problem successfully which might cause a war.

And I believe that there is still another cause of peace at work in the world. That is that the peoples of the future will see not only the benefits but the necessity of arbitration if the world would be saved from destruction. A little less than three hundred years ago there ended in Germany the Thirty Years War. It left Germany a heap of ruins with 50 per cent of its population destroyed; yet this was but a very elementary kind of war—gunpowder was still a novelty. Wars have grown since then and the destructive elements in the wars of the present and of the future are many times greater than the wars of the past.

Another great war will see the complete collapse of our present economic system. War debts are things of the present. The first great war debt was that of England after the Napoleonic wars; and the resulting thirty years of tumult and the destruction of the English agricultural classes was but the result of this, to our eyes, comparatively insignificant debt. The Civil War added two billion dollars to the debt of our nation. It has never been paid and probably never will be. Another example of the tremendous cost of modern preparation for war is the fact that England in 1922 spent \$173,000,000,000 for arms, this in a time when no war loomed up on the borders of Europe. If you think these sums tremendous examine the cost of the World War.

Direct cost of World War—186 billion dollars.

Indirect cost of World War—150 billion dollars.

Ten million men were destroyed.

The Great war cost more in a day than the total cost of any other war in history and this cost will of necessity be increased in the future. No nation has ever paid its war debt and no nation ever will. The inevitable result of future wars will be the economic bankruptcy of the world. Yet there is another cause that is not able to be measured in terms of dollars and cents—the type of men killed! Wars take the best of the population in the full vigor of their manhood and return them to their countries physical wrecks. We can see in some ways what war has done. The Frenchman of today is three inches shorter than his ancestor in 1790 and this is the result of the destruction of their best man power during the Napoleonic Wars. We

unfortunately are not able to measure the mental destruction in a nation. Any nation that persists in a career of warfare destroys itself. Men like Haeckel and Spencer have warned us of the evil effects of war upon the man power of a nation. For fifty years Spain was the mistress of the world and for the next three hundred she paid the cost of this temporary mastery. All these happened to a certain extent in wars of the past, and still these were elementary wars.

We have not spoken, My Friends, of that most interesting experiment of the last war—poison gas. It was but an infant in the last war still we may see the horrible effect.

Auld in his famous book *Gas and Flame* describes that historic afternoon on the 22d of April, 1915, when the French saw a vast cloud of greenish-yellow gas slowly moving towards them. First wonder, then fear, then as the first fringes of a cloud enveloped them, choking—panic. Those who could move broke and ran. Those who recovered from this poison gas will always remember it. Hardened men of the world have wept when they thought of their experiences in a gas attack. They will tell you of the terrors of the battlefield drenched with gas. The gases of the last war were comparatively simple. They scattered phosphorous which merely kept burning when it came in contact with human flesh, chlorine and chloropicrin—simple gases—that forced men to remove their gas masks and die in the most frightful agony.

Yet even mustard gas, the most effective gas used in the last war and now obsolete, can on a warm, cloudless night destroy an entire city. Civilization within the cruising radius of an airplane is at the mercy of this gas.

General John Fries, head of the Chemical Warfare Service says that the use of gas in the last war was a farce compared to what it will be in the future. Thus basing our conclusion on the known facts as regards the present development of chemical warfare it can truthfully and without contradiction be said that if another war occurs every form of death-dealing chemical agent will be used irrespective of age, sex or location with the ultimate end of accomplishing as wide as possible a destruction in the shortest possible time. Villages of non-combatants were wiped out in the last war; yet think, My Friends, of the future. Brigadier General Lord Thompson has prophesied that the next war will be fought in the air and think for a moment of airplanes

controlled by radios made of practically invisible metal which can reach any city in a night. And to go on, Thompson says, "The primary attack will be against civilians including women and children; no defense of a city so attacked is possible."

A new gas was announced to the world on December 12, 1928 which is described by the distinguished chemist, Dr. Hilton Jones: "It is a deadly poison and will destroy armies as a man might snuff out a candle. War, if it comes again and is to be deadly, will never again be fought with shot and shell. It is so much cheaper to destroy life wholesale with this new gas. It will destroy armies, peoples and cities more thoroughly, more effectively and more quickly. If we do not arbitrate we must be destroyed. The wild animals will make their dwelling places in your homes, and as Omar sang of past civilization, "The Lion and the Leopard keep the court where Jaurid gloried and drank deep.'"

You may laugh at this, My Friends, and say that international agreement on gas will do away with the dangers of such a war, yet you must realize that every warring nation believes itself thoroughly right and that it is performing God's mission upon earth. No belligerent will stop at anything to attain his end. Can reasoning humanity, knowing this, refuse to arbitrate? All that I have ever mentioned about poisoned gas is an established fact and yet there are greater possibilities. The power of the atom which scientists tell us can destroy our earth is a potential weapon of the greatest value. On the declaration of war the cities of a nation will be destroyed from the air and the civilization that man has been building up for one hundred thousand years will go down into dust. I am not trying to scare you—I am trying to draw a picture—a picture of the truth. Another great conflict will mean the end of humanity—understanding this, will the great nations of the world refuse to submit their problems to arbitration?

Our opponents may say that they are not defending the institution of warfare, but that rather they question whether arbitration will achieve the end desired—that of abolishing warfare. One thing can certainly be granted—war is too firmly fixed as an institution to be destroyed unless men set themselves to the task in a full determination to put an end to the hated thing forever. The old diplomacy has operated since the dawn of history, yet history is little more than a record of war after

war. Arbitration has been seriously considered, at intervals, only during the past century—and already there is a list of triumphs. The Alabama claims, the Venezuela, etc. Up to the present there has been no real desire on the part of the world rulers to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. There now is such a desire; more than that, there is a realization that warfare and civilization cannot continue in the same world. With arbitration as an honestly accepted policy, there is now a possibility for peace on earth to men of good will.

We realize that we are not able by what we say here tonight to force upon the world a new era of peace, but we have endeavored in this debate to show that there is a new world mentality desirous of peace and that arbitration will soon be recognized by the world, not as a vague dream, but as a vital necessity if civilization is to be saved from destruction. The task is by no means complete but we tried to show in a logical manner the forces working for arbitration and the possibilities of its success.

THIRD NEGATIVE

William J. Mountjoy, Victoria

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN: I have listened with some degree of interest to the arguments which have been brought forward on the other side against war, and I must say that I feel myself in complete accord with what has been said, but I do wish they had said something on the motion. Our tour is not merely a debating tour. Our object is also to create good will between the two great English speaking nations. Surely the object of such a good will tour is to stop war, and surely our purpose is to prevent war and not to advocate it. We too feel that the world cannot afford another war, but some people not realizing the true position think things can be left to arbitration. This however is not a sufficient means to maintain the peace of the world. Certainly arbitration has settled some disputes and though we hope it can settle many, we realize it cannot settle all but if we are lulled into a sense of false security and complacently believe that ambition alone is sufficient to prevent war, I am convinced that we will be plunged into another war whether we can stand it or not. Surely causes still operate which, unless we can find

some other system better than arbitration, will certainly and inevitably lead to the greatest wars this world has ever seen. My friend of the Affirmative side said we might think he was painting an exaggerated picture, when he spoke of the horrors of war. We do not. We abhor war as much as they, but we do not think arbitration alone will prevent war.

My friends have referred to the League of Nations as a means of settling international disputes, but the League works not thru arbitration but thru intervention. Arbitration, as you will find it defined in any good dictionary, is the reference of disputes to a third party for decision, together with an undertaking by both parties to carry out that decision. We submit that arbitration alone is not sufficient and the world must undertake some better way to prevent the horrors of war. But my friend didn't say it could settle all international disputes, but merely that he thought that it might, he believed that it should, and he hoped that it would. We say that it cannot.

In the first instance, in support of arbitration, my friends said that the states of America had combined to force Chile and Peru not to go to war. That was not arbitration. There was no reference of a dispute to a third party for decision with the understanding that both parties were to carry out the decision, but it was the effort of a stronger power to force peace on the parties. Intervention but not arbitration.

My friend admitted that there was only one way out for China—war. Surely that is admitting that all disputes cannot be settled by arbitration. War is not international arbitration, consequently they have admitted that their case is not true, that at least one case could not be so settled, and consequently all international disputes cannot be settled by arbitration. Furthermore, they did say also that Russia and China had settled their dispute by arbitration. As a matter of fact Mukden had been forced to surrender to Russia. Nanking had nothing to do but draw up a treaty. If you call drawing up a treaty after war, arbitration, you might as well say that the dispute between Germany and Belgium in 1914 was settled by arbitration after four years of war.

The League of Nations does not work thru arbitration, does not profess to, and in practice does not. Let me mention how it worked. On October 19th, 1925, hostilities were about to commence on the Greek-Bulgarian front. Shots were fired and

regular warfare commenced. On October 23d, Bulgaria invoked articles ten and eleven of the Covenant of the League. On October 26th, an extraordinary session of the Council of the League ordered the unconditional cessation of hostilities and forced the parties to accept the conditions of the report of the League's Commission of Inquiry. As a result the war stopped. This cannot be said to be the result of arbitration. It was the result of intervention by a body that had the power to have its demands enforced. Arbitration would not have succeeded here as intervention did.

This is typical of the action of the League—intervention, not arbitration.

With reference to the first speaker's speech. He said books of the day reflected a very strong public opinion against war, and mentioned *Journey's End*. May I refer to Galsworthy's *Mob* played in London before the war, showing up the horrors of war and its attendant evils? He quoted *All Quiet on the Western Front*. Might I refer to Angell's *Great Illusion* in which he proved that war was not only horrible but futile? Many, many people were opposed to war in principle in 1914; but they were not able to apply principles to facts, and consequently, as Mr. Powles has shown, war was precipitated. We have not to any great extent changed in public opinion. A few years ago there was a war scare between Great Britain and Turkey. Great Britain cabled the colonies to know if there would be support, and thruout New Zealand the reply resounded, My country, right or wrong, and men flocked to the barracks and asked to be recruited for this war. Yet our friends say the spirit of nationalism is dead. Perhaps we might wish it were. Yet if we look at this in the light of cold reason and in the light of political conditions today, we must admit that nationalism is not dead, we must admit we must have something better than mere willingness to have disputes referred to arbitration. My friends said, "The world today would not stand for war." Well! I don't know how the Americans stand for the marines in Nicaragua. I don't know how the United States and Great Britain stood for their little war with China, for the presence of warships, for bombardments and battles. Many people were killed, and with many of the horrors of war. Why? The United States and England had economic interests in China. They went there to protect them, they went there to enforce

their claims—surely an economic cause. Yet my friends said that economic factors as causes of war no longer had any effect.

Mention was made of the good will created by Ramsay MacDonald in the United States. There always has been a good deal of good will between the United States and our country. But might I point out the effect of the work of Snowden at the Hague, and the bad feeling he created between France and England? We deplore that, but cannot deny it. Might I point out briefly the conditions that exist in Germany and in France today? In Germany there is still an anti-French feeling. Perhaps a mere student's authority is not sufficient. May I quote Professor MacDougall in his book *Janus* recently published?

From one end of Germany to the other, an intense hatred of France unites the whole population. This passion is fanned continuously by the action of the French government. The enormous contingents of German youth growing to military manhood year by year are inspired by the fiercest sentiments and the soul of Germany smoulders with dreams of a war of liberation or revenge. These ideas are restrained at the present moment only by physical impotence. France is armed to the teeth. Germany has been to a great extent disarmed and her military system broken up . . . But, Germany is a far stronger entity than France and cannot be kept in permanent subjugation.

Might I point out that like the Act of the Congress of Vienna, the Treaty of Versailles was not a settlement, but merely the beginning of another long series of struggles? In Europe today Germany, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and many Central European nations regard the Treaty of Versailles as an agreement that cannot possibly remain unchanged. On the other hand, France, Roumania, Poland, and several other states regard the absolute maintenance of the present conditions as the essential point of their national policy. On the one hand, one half of Europe believes that the maintenance of existing conditions is a lesser evil than war while the other half would fight rather than yield. It is not likely that arbitration alone could unravel this tangle.

Might I ask you what would be the attitude of America if she were asked to submit the question of the unlimited admission of Asiatics to the United States to arbitration? In the first place it is not likely that she would submit such a question to arbitration and if the decision went against her, as conceivably it might, would she accept the award? I am convinced that she would prefer war to such a course; and I am still more con-

vinced that Australians would fight to the last drop of blood rather than abandon their white Australian policy. Nor is it likely that America would submit to an arbitration award liberating the Filipinos. Nationalism grows and lives. I think it must live. I cannot see how nationalism can die.

But my time is nearly up. If arbitration is not sufficient, what shall we do? Must we look forward to a future, black with the horrors of war? I think not. I think that the policy which my friends supported is the policy which we must support, the policy of intervention. I think we should have a World Court powerful enough to enforce its judgments upon the belligerent nations and so maintain peace. I am not talking mere idealism, but advocating a practical scheme which will be put before the League of Nations in the course of the next few months. A great fleet of armed aeroplanes, representing international interests, powerful enough to subdue any nation will be ready day and night to mass menacingly wherever war threatens the peace of the world. It is being brought forward by Clifford Harman, and Professor MacDougall has examined this suggestion and has found no flaw in it. It is quite in accord with the principle of disarmament. You could abandon all armaments and restrict the speed of commercial planes to one hundred miles an hour, so that any disturbance can be effectively dealt with by this police force.

I think that if we examine the existing conditions dispassionately, we must realize that no nation would submit to the indignity of having its most cherished rights overturned by arbitration, nor would a nation always put adverse decisions into effect. When the United States met this situation some years ago and the decision went against her, she refused to put it into effect. That was a boundary dispute with Canada. The Court of Arbitration decided against the United States, and so the United States decided against the Court of Arbitration. That situation will come up again and again. If we put our faith in arbitration alone we will find it not effective, we will be plunged into war, and there will be no way out. I think arbitration will help, but to say that all disputes can be settled by arbitration is futile. My friends say that they think arbitration might settle all disputes and they hope it will. I, too, hope that arbitration will be used more, and that the League of Nations, and the Kellogg Pact, neither of which are arbitration, will be used more and help to

prevent war, and I submit the utmost conviction that arbitration as a means of settling all international disputes cannot be settled by arbitration.

CHAIRMAN—We should now like to take a vote on the merits of the question. Will all who are in favor of the proposition, "Resolved, that all matters of international dispute can be settled by arbitration," kindly raise their hands? Will those who support the Negative kindly raise their hands? By a count of hands it appears that the audience favors the negative side of the proposition. Thank you.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARBITRATION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Books on the work of the League of Nations cataloged in the Library of the Secretariat. 274p. The Library. Geneva, Switzerland. '28.
- Buttenheim, M. Aids to international relations; a book list with notes. 16p. sup. 10p. The Compiler. 44 Crescent Road, Madison, N. J.
- International arbitration. 14p. typew. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Library. 700 Jackson Pl. N. W. Wash. D.C. '28.
- International Book News. p. 3-5. F. '30. Bibliography on the world court.
- Jordan, D. S. For international peace; a list of books, reviews, and other articles, 1898 to 1927. 24p. Stanford Univ. Press. '27.
- League of Nations. Secretariat. Books on the work of the League of Nations cataloged in the library of the Secretariat. pa. \$1. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- Library Journal. 53:889. N. 1, '28. International understanding; a brief reading list.
- Library Journal. 54:984-5. D. 1, '29. Book selection on world affairs; international relations.
- Library Journal. 55:230-1. Mr. 1, '30. Book selection on world affairs; international organization.
- Nitchie, Elizabeth and others, comps. Pens for ploughshares: a bibliography of creative literature that encourages world peace. (Useful ref. ser. no. 40). 106p. \$1.50. Faxon. '30.
- United States. Library of Congress. League of Nations: a brief list of recent references. 8p. mim. Wash. D.C. Ap. 10, '30.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Academy of Political Science. Preservation of peace. P. T. Moon, ed. 131p. \$2.50. The Academy. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '29.
- Allen, D., ed. Pacificism in the modern world. xviii,278p. \$2. Doubleday, Doran. Garden City, N.Y. '29.
- American Foundation. Analysis of the arbitrations to which the United States has been a party. gratis. The Foundation. 565 5th Ave. N.Y. '27.
- American Foundation. Draft of a proposed general treaty for the pacific settlement of international disputes. gratis. The Foundation. 565 5th Ave. N.Y. '27.
- Bakhtmeteff, B. A. Legacy of war—peace. vi,53p. \$2. Houghton Mifflin. N.Y. '27.
- Bassett, J. S. League of Nations. ix,415p. \$3.50. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '28.
- Bornes, H. E. World politics in modern civilization: the contributions of nationalism, capitalism, imperialism and militarism to human culture and international anarchy. 608p. \$6.50. Knopf. N.Y. '30.
- Boulter, V. M., comp. Survey of international affairs, 1925; supplement. \$4.25. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '28.
- Brewster, H. S. Madness of war. xii,261p. \$2. Harper. N.Y. '28.
- Buell, R. L. Europe: a history of ten years. new ed. rev. \$2.50. college ed. \$2. vii,452p. Macmillan. N.Y. '29.
- Buell, R. L. International relations. (American political science series) 2d rev. ed. xix,838p. \$5. students' ed. \$4. Henry Holt. N.Y. '29.
- Bullard, Arthur. American diplomacy in the modern world. vi, 10-127p. \$1.50. Univ. of Pa. Press. '28.
- Butler, Sir Geoffrey Gilbert. Handbook to the League of Nations. 2d ed. xvi,239p. \$4. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '28.
- Call, A. D. Our country and world peace. 169p. \$1. Y.M.C.A. Estes Park Conference. 221 Y.M.C.A. Bldg. Denver. '26.

- Carr, W. G. Education for world citizenship. ix,225p. \$2.50. Stanford Univ. Press. '28.
- Cecil, E. A. R. International arbitration. 26p. 70c. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '28.
- Cecil, E. A. R. Way of peace. 256p. \$3. John Day. N.Y. '29.
- Conference on the cause and cure of war. 4th, 1929. Report on the 4th conference held in Washington, D.C., January 14-17, 1929. 50c. National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War. 1116 Grand Central Terminal Bldg. N.Y. '29.
- Corliss, J. B., jr. Peace versus politics. xiv,109p. \$1.25. Utopia Press. Detroit, or The Author. 70 Longfellow Ave. Detroit. '28.
- D'Abernon, E. V., 1st Viscount. Rapalo to Dawes, 1922-1924: the diary of an ambassador. 350p. \$5. Doubleday, Doran. Garden City, N.Y. '30.
- Davie, M. R. Evolution of war. x,391p. \$4. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '29. *Also* Yale publications in economics, social science and government. Yale Univ. Press. New Haven. '29.
- Donaldson, John. International economic relations. xxx,674p. \$3.20. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '28.
- Dunn, F. S. Practice and procedure of international conferences. (Johns Hopkins Univ. studies in history and political science. New series, no. 6) xiv,229p. \$2.50. Johns Hopkins Univ. Balt. '29.
- Ferrero, Guglielmo. Problems of peace from the Holy Alliance to the League of Nations; a message from a European writer to Americans. \$1.50. Putnam. N.Y. '19.
- Fiori, V. E. de. Mussolini; the man of destiny. xx,222p. \$3. Dutton. N.Y. '28.
- Galsworthy, John. Mob; a play in 4 acts. \$1. Scribner. N.Y. '14.
- General pact for the renunciation of war; text and other papers. 71p. Supt. of Documents. Wash. D.C. '28.
- Gerould, J. T. Selected articles on the Pact of Paris. (Handbook Series III, vol. 1) xiv,287p. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '29.
- Gibbons, H. A. Nationalism and internationalism. (World unity library) xi,273p. Stokes. N.Y. '30.

- Gowen, H. H. and others. Problems in international understanding. 199p. pa. \$1.50. Univ. of Washington Book Store. Seattle. '28.
- Harris, H. W. Arms or arbitration? 5-93p. pa. 2s6d. Hogarth Press. 52 Travistock Sq. London, W.C. 1. '28.
- Higgins, A. P. British acceptance of compulsory arbitration under the optional clause and its implications. 24p. pa. 6d. Heffer. Lond. '29.
- Hill, N. L. Public international conference; its function, organization and procedure. xi,276p. \$3. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '29.
- Holzman, J. M. Pacifist imperialism; a plea for peace and power. 96p. 3s6d. Williams and Norgate. Lond. '30.
- Hudson, M. O. World Court, 1922-1929. rev. ed. 198,xiip. \$1.75. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '29.
- Jessup, P. C. United States and the World Court. 159p. 40c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '29.
- Jessup, P. C. United States and treaties for the avoidance of war. (International Conciliation no. 239) 71p. 5c. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y. '28.
- Jones, R. and Sherman, S. S. League of Nations from idea to reality. xvi,213p. \$1.50. Pitman. N.Y. '27.
- Kaltenborn, H. We look at the world. x,13-272p. \$3. Rae D. Henkle. N.Y. '30.
- Keen, F. N. Real security against war. 32p. 1s. Williams and Norgate. Lond. '29.
- Kenworthy, J. M. Peace or war? xvii,23-338p. \$2.50. Boni and Liveright. N.Y. '27.
- Lauterpacht, H. Private law sources and analogies of international law. 326p. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '27.
- League of Nations. Pacific settlement of international disputes, non-aggression and mutual assistance. 40c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- League of Nations. Preparatory Committee for the disarmament conference. Committee on arbitration and security. Report of the committee on the work of its fourth session held at Geneva, April 28-May 9, 1930. (1930, VII, 2) 24p. 20c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '30.
- Lecomte, G. C. Georges Clemenceau, the tiger of France. \$1.75. D. Appleton. N.Y. '19.

- Limitation of naval armaments; records of the Conference for the limitation of naval armament held at Geneva, Switzerland, from June 20 to August 4, 1927. 220p. United States Govt. Ptg. Off. Wash. D.C. '28.
- Ludwig, Emil. July '14. 5-378p. \$3.50. Putnam. N.Y. '29.
- McDougall, William. Janus, the conquest of war; a psychological inquiry. (Today and Tomorrow series) xiii,159p. \$1. E. P. Dutton. N.Y. '27.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. Disarmament. xiii,379p. \$5. Coward-McCann. N.Y. '29.
- Marvin, F. S., ed. Unity of western civilization. (Unity series, no. 1) 3d ed. 316p. \$2.50. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '29.
- Mead, L. T. Law or war. ix,276p. \$1.75. Doubleday, Doran. Garden City, N.Y. '28.
- Newfang, Oscar. United States of the world: a comparison between the League of Nations and the United States of America. 284p. \$2. Putnam. N.Y. '30.
- Nussbaum, Arthur, ed. International yearbook on civil and commercial arbitration. xvi,418p. \$4.25. Oxford University Press. N.Y. '28.
- Petrescu, Nicholas. Interpretation of national differentiations. 248p. 7s6d. Watts and Co. Lond. '29.
- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1923-1924. Vol. X. Bok peace plan. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '24.
- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1927-1928. Vol. XIV. National sovereignty—a concept to be discarded. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '28.
- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1928-1929. Vol. XV. Pact of Paris. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '29.
- Potter, P. B. Introduction to the study of international organization. 3d ed. rev. and enl. xv,587p. \$4. Century. N.Y. '28.
- Potter, P. B. This world of nations: foundations, institutions, practices. xix,366p. \$4. Macmillan. N.Y. '29.
- Problems of peace; lectures delivered at the Geneva institute of international relations. 3 vols. 1st, \$4.25. 2d, 3d, ea. \$3.50. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '27-'29.
- Ralston, J. H. International arbitration from Athens to Locarno. xvi,417p. \$5. Stanford Univ. Press. '29.
- Ralston, J. H. Law and procedure of international tribunals. rev. ed. \$7.50. Stanford Univ. Press. '26.

- Randall, J. H. A world community, the supreme task of the twentieth century. (World unity library) xvii,294p. \$2.50. Stokes. N.Y. '30.
- Rappard, W. E. Uniting Europe. xvii,309p. Yale Univ. Press. New Haven. '30.
- Remarque, E. M. All quiet on the western front. 291p. \$2.50. Little, Brown. Bost. '29. (Also published in unexpurgated translation by E. P. Dutton. N.Y. '30)
- Royal Institute of International Affairs. Directory of societies and organizations in Great Britain concerned with the study of international affairs. S. A. Heald, comp. 64p. 1s6d. The Institute. Lond. '29.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs. Documents on international affairs, 1928. J. W. Wheeler-Bennett, ed. 254p. 12s6d. Oxford Univ. Press. Lond. '29.
- Scott, J. B. Judicial settlement of international disputes. 79p. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '27.
- Sherriff, R. C. Journey's end. 204p. \$2. Brentano. N.Y. '29.
- Shotwell, J. T. War as an instrument of national policy and its renunciation in the Pact of Paris. x,310p. \$3.50. Harcourt, Brace. N.Y. '28.
- Smith, F. B. Must we have war? 318p. \$2.50. Harper. N.Y. '29.
- Smith, H. L. and Chamberlain, L. M. Analysis of the attitudes of American educators and others toward a program of education for world friendship and understanding. (School of Education. Bull. vol. 5, no. 4) 109p. pa. 50c. Indiana Univ. Bloomington. '29.
- Soviet Union and peace. 280p. \$2.25. International publishers. N.Y. '29.
- Stawell, F. M. The growth of international thought. (Home university of modern knowledge) 252p. 2s6d. Butterworth. 15 Bedford St. Lond. W.C. 2. '29.
- Stratton, G. M. Social psychology of international conduct. x,387p. \$3. D. Appleton. N.Y. '29.
- Thomas, Norman and others. In the League and out. (Pamphlet ser. 1929-30. no.63) 31p. 15c. Foreign Policy Assn. N.Y. '30.
- Van Kirk, W. W. Highways to international good will. 190p. \$1. Abingdon Press. N.Y. '30.

PERIODICALS

- Accountant. 82:299-301. Mr. 8, '30. International agreements. J. H. Jones.
- American Bar Association Journal. 16:229-34. Ap. '30. Progress in settlement on international disputes by judicial methods. F. K. Nielsen.
- American Economic Review. 16:1-13. Mr. '26. Economics and war. A. A. Young.
- American Historical Review. 32:219-31. Ja. '27. War and history. D. C. Munro.
- American Journal of International Law. 23:595-602. Jl. '29. New arbitration treaties of the United States. J. W. Garner.
- American Journal of Sociology. 32:237-49. S. '26. Meaning of nationality and Americanization. P. A. Speck.
- American Journal of Sociology. 32:396-411. N. '26. Social background of Asiatic nationalism. N. J. Spykman.
- American Mercury. 11:385-92. Ag. '27. In praise of war. A. B. Conway.
- American Society of International Law. Proceedings. 1929:1-13. Institutions of peace. C. E. Hughes.
- American Society of International Law. Proceedings. 1929:88-109. Pact of Paris for the renunciation of war: its meaning and effect in international law; with discussion. R. S. Morris.
- American Society of International Law. Proceedings. 1929:110-43. Scope and character of arbitration treaties; with discussion. C. P. Anderson.
- American Society of International Law. Proceedings. 1929:144-75. Place of commissions of inquiry and conciliation treaties in the peaceful settlement of international disputes; with discussion. C. C. Hyde.
- Annalist. 32:142-3+. Jl. 27, '28. Anti-war treaty; text.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 120:1-180. Jl. '25. American policy and international security.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 126:56-8. Jl. '26. American obstacles to arbitration and conciliation. J. G. MacDonald.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 126:65-7. Jl. '26. Successful League of Nations the basis of European security. Herbert Feis.

- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 134:132-9. N. '27. Contribution of the League of Nations to the economic recovery of Europe. Sir Arthur Salter.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 138:1-181. Jl. '28. Some aspects of the present international situation. ed. by C. L. King.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 138:120-53. Jl. '28. Arbitration treaties. P. C. Jessup and others.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 138:140-5. Jl. '28. Monroe doctrine and arbitration. Kirby Page.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 138:146-50. Jl. '28. Summary of the stages in the development of arbitration. Clyde Eagleton.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 138:154-8. Jl. '28. Disarmament. H. W. Taft and others.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:1-150. Jl. '29. Present day causes of international friction and their elimination.
- Atlantic Monthly. 141:258-71. F. '28. Independence or isolation? H. H. Powers.
- Atlantic Monthly. 142:181-7. Ag. '28. Political equivalent of war. Walter Lippmann.
- Atlantic Monthly. 143:116-22. Ja. '29. Peace on earth, and the U. S. A. William Martin.
- Atlantic Monthly. 144:1-11. Jl. '29. America at the crossroads. F. B. Sayre.
- Boston University Law Review. 9:239-52. N. '29. Legal effect of the Kellogg-Briand treaty. E. A. Harriman.
- Century. 115:288-95. Ja. '28. Such stuff as wars are made of. H. K. Norton.
- Century. 120:203-10. Ap. '30. World government. Salvador de Madariaga.
- China Weekly Review. 51:277-8. Ja. 25, '30. How the Kellogg pact was invoked in Soviet-Chinese dispute. H. S. Quigley.
- Christian Century. 46:803-6. Je. 19, '29. Peace mind is coming. R. C. Ellsworth.
- Christian Century. 46:1304-5. O. 23, '29. War impossible.

- Commerce and Finance. 18:850-1. Ap. 17, '29. Staggering accretion of national debt. M'Cready Sykes.
- Commerce and Finance. 19:266-7. Ja. 29, '30. Ramsay MacDonald's address to the world.
- Contemporary Review. 127:509-22. Ap. '25. Mirage of security. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 129:103-7. Ja. '26. Disarmament and arbitration. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 132:509-16. O. '27. Geneva, the protocol and arbitration. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 135:432-40. Ap. '29. Next step in international organization.
- Contemporary Review. 135:688-94. Je. '29. Saving faith of internationalism. J. A. Hobson.
- Current History. 23:656-62. F. '26. America's unfavorable attitude toward arbitration treaties. D. P. Myers.
- Current History. 24:404-10. Je. '26. Planning new horrors in warfare. C. A. Tinker.
- Current History. 27:453-7. Ja. '28. Our traditional policy justified. T. E. Burton.
- Current History. 28:77-80. Ap. '28. Challenge, and menace, of the nationalistic spirit. Leo Gershey.
- Current History. 28:435-41. Je. '28. Why nationalism flames in the Balkans. A. Angeloff.
- Current History. 30:181-8. My. '29. Nationalism aflame throughout the world. Nicholas Roosevelt.
- Current History. 31:317-21. N. '29. Disunited states of Europe.
- Current History. 31:653-82. Ja. '30. League of Nations and the United States pro and con. H. V. Kaltenborn; J. H. Clarke; D. J. Hill; P. M. Brown.
- Educational Review. 72:37-44. Je. '26. Education for peace. B. F. Pittenger.
- Foreign Affairs. 6:459-67. Ap. '28. Alternatives for war. J. F. Shotwell.
- Foreign Affairs. 7:282-91. Ja. '29. Arbitration in the western hemisphere. A. S. de Bustamante.
- Foreign Affairs. 7 sup:i-xiii. O. '29. 50c. The risks of peace. J. R. MacDonald.
- Fortnightly Review. 123:433-41. Ap. '25. Pacts of peace or war. John Bell.

- Fortnightly Review. 126:367-77. S. '26. League at the cross-roads. H. F. Spender.
- Fortnightly Review. 129:1-10. Ja. '28. Compulsory arbitration. Sir Francis Taylor Piggott.
- Fortnightly Review. 129:11-22. Ja. '28. Plea for the protocol. J. H. Harley.
- Fortnightly Review. 132:132-4. Jl. '29. Arms or friendship. Amicus.
- Harper's Magazine. 155:291-301. Ag. '27. Psychology of nationalism. F. H. Allport.
- Historical Outlook. 20:273-9. O. '29. Nationalism in German history textbooks after the war. P. E. Lutz.
- Historical Outlook. 20:321-4. N. '29. Early plans for world peace. J. E. Demeyer.
- Institute of International Relations. Proceedings. 4:165-7. '29. Place of world literature in international relations. M. C. Struble.
- International Conciliation. 208:75-109. Mr. '25. Plans and protocols to end war; historical outline and guide. J. T. Shotwell.
- International Conciliation. 212:225-63. S. '25. European security; addresses. Edward Benes; A. Chamberlain; J. R. MacDonald.
- International Conciliation. 229:149-61. Ap. '27. Turning point in history. J. T. Shotwell.
- International Conciliation. 232:326-62. S. '27. United States and the Permanent court of international justice. Quincy Wright.
- International Conciliation. 239:181-245. Ap. '28. United States and treaties for the avoidance of war. P. C. Jessup.
- International Conciliation. 242:414-35. S. '28. Cooperation against war thru the League of Nations.
- International Conciliation. 244:537-67. N. '28. Post-war treaties of security and mutual guaranty. N. L. Hill.
- International Conciliation. 256:5-64. Ja. '30. First ten years of the League of Nations.
- International Conciliation. 257:65-124. F. '30. British arbitration policies. N. L. Hill.
- International Conciliation. 259:193-229. Ap. '30. The eighth year of the Permanent court of international justice. M. O. Hudson.

- Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers. 16:141-203. Ap. '29. Arbitration. C. B. Breed.
- Journal of Education. 109:424-6. Ap. 15, '29. National to international. C. W. Heathcote.
- Journal of Geography. 28:169-78. Ap. '29. Geography and world citizenship. L. O. Packard.
- Journal of Political Economy. 36:417-46. Ag. '28. Nationalism and economic theory. J. E. Moffat.
- Journal of the American Association of University Women. 23:145-8. Ap. '30. Fifth conference on the cause and cure of war.
- Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. 9:1-22. Ja. '30. British empire and the Pan-American idea. L. S. Amery.
- Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. 9:288-324. My. '30. Europe and the United States. Philip Kerr.
- Ladies' Home Journal. 45:8-9. Ap., 12-13. My. '28. What price peace? Kathleen Norris.
- Living Age. 334:1031-8. Jl. '28. America and world peace. R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi; Salvador de Madariaga.
- National Education Association Journal. 15:135-7. My. '26. What is the World Court? Montiville Flowers.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1927:718-29. Evolution of a substitute for war, and how America may share in it without becoming entangled in European political affairs. J. H. Clarke.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1929:36-42. America's part in bringing about world peace. Josephus Daniels.
- New Republic. 57:8-9. N. 21, '28. Monroe doctrine and the League. R. L. Buell.
- Nineteenth Century and After. 104:650-8. N. '28. Elimination of war. J. F. C. Fuller.
- North American Review. 228:399-404. O. '29. War against war. J. G. Harbord.
- Outlook and Independent. 151:404-7. Mr. 13, '29. Does business mean peace? J. T. Shotwell.
- Outlook and Independent. 154:409-11. Mr. 12, '30. Peas in the international pod; dissimilarities among nations. J. T. Shotwell.

- Queen's Quarterly. 37:105-21. Winter '30. Is "civilized warfare" possible? C. P. Stacey.
- Quarterly Review. 253:177-99. Jl. '29. Suppression of war. Thomas Baty.
- Review of Reviews. 75:629-34. Je. '27. Differences between the two world courts. C. L. W. Meyer.
- Review of Reviews. 77:418-20. Ap. '28. American policy of preventing war.
- Saturday Evening Post. 201:3-5. Ag. 11, '28. What has happened to war. Garet Garrett.
- Scribner's Magazine. 81:396-400. Ap. '27. Next war and how to nip it. A. L. Guérard.
- Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly. 10:279-89. D. '29. International regulation of national action for self-defense. P. B. Potter.
- World's Work. 55:427-32. F. '28. Hunger as a cause of war. H. K. Norton.
- World's Work. 55:646-51. Ap. '28. Back of war; too many people as a cause of strife. H. K. Norton.
- World Tomorrow. 12:371-4. S. '29. International economic cooperation. Kirby Page.
- World Tomorrow. 12:428. O. '29. Another voice for the co-operatives; reply to Kirby Page. Henry Askeli.
- World Tomorrow. 13:248-58. Je. '30. The next ten years of the League. R. L. Buell.
- World Unity. 5:375-86. Mr. '30. Phases of world citizenship. C. A. Ross.
- Yale Review. 14:683-98. Jl. '25. War risks in economic conflicts. Sir Arthur Clavell Salter.
- Yale Review. 15:13-29. O. '25. Future of American imperialism. R. L. Buell.
- Yale Review. 15:209-25. Ja. '26. Beginning of the peace. Charles Seymour.

CHAPTER IV

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA

versus

COLORADO STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

RESOLVED: *That the nations should adopt a plan of complete disarmament, except for such forces as are needed for police purposes.*

This is a stenographic report of the debate between an Affirmative team representing the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, and a Negative team representing the State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado, held at Greeley, March 22, 1930. The affirmative team was coached by Professor Nichols and the negative team by Mr. Lew K. Barney. Professor G. W. Finley, national secretary of Pi Kappa Delta, was the chairman for the evening. The judges, W. E. Anderson, broker, W. R. Kelly, attorney, and O. G. Inman, insurance manager, gave a unanimous decision for the Affirmative. This report was secured thru Professor G. W. Finley of Colorado State Teachers College.

BRIEF

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION :

- A. The question of disarmament is by no means new.
 - 1. The first meeting to discuss disarmament was called by Abbott Charles Irn   de St. Pierre in 1713.
 - a. Nothing was accomplished.
 - 2. Since then, there have been many conferences on disarmament.
- B. Nations have two chief divisions of their military forces.
 - 1. Such forces as are needed and in use for police protection.
 - 2. The dormant force, held in readiness for use in case of war.
 - a. This includes the bulk of all the armies and navies of today.
 - b. It is this force that the Affirmative propose to do away with.
- I. Disarmament is desirable.
 - A. It will mean a tremendous saving in money.
 - 1. The World War cost \$186,000,000,000.
 - a. In 1918, it cost \$60,000,000 an hour.
 - 2. The costs of arms in times of peace are immense.
 - a. In 1929, France spent the equivalent of \$450,000,000 for the upkeep of her army and navy.
 - b. Italy spent nearly \$300,000,000.
 - c. President Hoover set the estimated sum of \$684,700,000 to be spent by the United States in 1929.
 - (1) This was an increase of \$60,000,000 over 1928.

3. Ninety-three per cent of the total income of the United States and 90 per cent of the taxes collected thruout the world go to the upkeep of armies and navies.

- a. How much this total cost might accomplish if it were diverted into productive industrial channels.

- (1) The cost of one battleship would endow a university and send one student to Europe for four years.

B. It will mean a tremendous saving in man power.

1. In the world war ten million were killed, twenty million crippled or gassed, nine million were orphaned and five million were made widows.

- a. The thirty million men could have done a great deal in advancing human progress.

2. Engineers relieved from the construction of war implements and ships could produce much in the way of machinery for industry.

3. Chemists and physicians, relieved from the inventing of more horrible poison gases, could do much in the study and cure of disease.

C. It will be an evolutionary step in human affairs that will place the people of the world in circumstances far better than they now enjoy.

II. Disarmament would bring about world peace and happiness.

A. The nations would have security.

1. Without arms, they would have to settle disagreements by arbitration, or by the decision of a tribunal.

B. Our trade routes would still be protected.

1. The nations would still keep the armed forces necessary for police protection.

C. Our capital and energy would be diverted to constructive purposes.

1. Ninety-three per cent of our income is too high to pay for protection by armed forces.

D. Disarmament will alleviate the causes of war.

1. Wars are the direct result of a vicious circle of fear, suspicion, envy, increasing armaments, increasing fear, etc.

a. If we break one link of the chain, we break the chain.

(1) This has happened in the case of the United States and Canada.

(a) Twenty-five years of belligerent enmity ceased with disarmament, on the signing of the Rush-Backet agreement.

(b) This is in great contrast to conditions on the border between Germany and France.

2. Nations will settle their disagreements thru civil tribunals.

a. The ground work for such tribunals is already laid.

(1) Many cases have been settled by arbitration in the past.

III. Disarmament is in accord with public opinion.

A. At the Paris conference, thirty-five nations voted in favor of obligatory arbitration.

1. These nations represent 85 per cent of the people of the entire world.

B. Every nation in the world has expressed itself as favoring peace.

C. Men who were in the last war do not want another one.

D. Mothers say war should be outlawed.

NEGATIVE

INTRODUCTION :

A. How is the term "police protection" to be defined?

1. What forces are to be included under this term?

2. Who will determine how much police protection each nation needs?

B. Just what does "complete disarmament" include?

1. Merchant ships can be transformed into fighting vessels.

2. Ship yards can become navy yards, and airplanes be turned into armaments.
3. How can the question of "potential armaments" be handled?

I. Disarmament is undesirable.

A. Politically.

1. Arms have offered the only security for maintenance of our sovereignty and independence.
 - a. Primitive man barricaded himself in his cave by piling stones at the entrance to use against his enemies.
 - b. The primeval hunter relied on his club, spear, or bow and arrow for protection of himself and those dependent upon him.
 - c. As the tribe and the clan followed in the course of development, armed protection became communal rather than personal.
 - d. As cities and nations developed, arms increased proportionately in number, effectiveness and organization.
2. Security and position are the sole purposes for which arms exist today.
 - a. Only those nations that have made adequate provision for armed protection have endured.
 - (1) The weakness of China and India in spite of their great population is due to lack of adequate protection.
 - (a) Such concessions as extraterritoriality are not demanded of the United States or England.
 - (2) Abyssinia, on the other hand, has always maintained her independence.
 - (a) She has always been ready to fight for it.
 - b. Backward nations are coming to realize this.
 - (1) They are proposing to provide themselves with adequate armaments.
 - (a) There is an effort in India right now to secure the return of the rights and liberties her people feel have been taken from them.

- (b) Modern history shows many other instances of nations rebelling against superior forces to regain their rights.
- 3. Rightly or wrongly, the world is committed to a policy of imperialism.
 - a. To maintain it requires arms.
 - b. Imperialist nations will not agree to do away with it.
 - (1) They will not disarm.
- B. Economically.
 - 1. Nations have their trade routes scattered all over the world.
 - a. They must be protected.
 - (1) Nations are dependent upon them.
 - (2) Without protection by arms they would be open to any kind of attack.
 - b. Piracy existed freely in the days before protection of trade routes was adequate.
 - (1) It would return if armed protection were removed.
 - 2. The cost of armaments is not excessive.
 - a. In the United States the cost of armaments is only \$5 per capita.
 - (1) This is not expensive insurance.
 - b. It is not unproductive.
 - (1) It gives employment to thousands of people.
 - (a) There are 250,000, men in our army and navy alone.
 - (b) Thousands more work to clothe and feed them, and manufacture things necessary for their existence.
- C. Socially.
 - 1. Such a change would be revolutionary.
 - a. It is a fallacious attempt to hurry social evolution which alone can bring about disarmament.
 - 2. The world is not ready for disarmament.
 - a. The causes of war are, if anything, on the increase.

II. Disarmament is impossible.

- A. It is a world wide problem and must be dealt with by all the nations.
 - 1. This could only be done by an international board acting as arbitrator.
- B. No plan of disarmament which may be presented would prove feasible.
 - 1. The nations of the earth would not agree on any specific type of international board.
 - a. Even if such a board were formed, it would not be able to carry out its judgments.
 - 2. The success of arbitration in the past has been due to the presence of arms.
 - 3. The League of Nations has been trying to formulate plans for disarmament.
 - a. They have not been successful.
 - 4. An economic boycott would not enable a world policy board to enforce its decisions.
 - a. The rest of the world would have to agree to the boycott.
 - b. If the nation were a self-sufficient one like the United States, on which many countries depend for their supplies, a boycott would only have adverse effect.
 - c. The board would have to have sovereignty to make the boycott effective.
 - (1) No nation with any national spirit would agree to submit to its dictates.
 - (a) The only tangible means of carrying out its decisions would be a show of arms.
 - 5. Such a board would be akin to the judicial department of any nation.
 - a. The decisions of a judicial department are useless without a police force to enforce them.
 - b. It would be ruled by the money interests of the world, as is our judicial department.
 - 6. Even if a nation strong in potential power did disarm, she could arm again very quickly.
 - a. Other nations would refuse to disarm thru fear of her.

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA

versus

COLORADO STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Glenn Jones, Southern California

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As our chairman has told you this evening, Mr. Boutzer and I are from California—the land of the lemon, the prune and the nut. I do not know which one I represent, although I can evaluate Mr. Boutzer. I am glad to see there is no balcony here. One time when I was speaking, a gentleman in the balcony kept getting up and saying something, which was very disturbing. I didn't listen to him until a gentleman right in front got up and called up to him, "Can't you hear this speaker?" The answer came, "That's why I am hollering 'Louder,' all the time." The gentleman in front said, "Shut up, you don't know how fortunate you are."

Our first duty is a pleasant one. We want to thank our hosts for the reception which has been extended to us. Mr. Boutzer and I are in favor of having debating teams travel. We are gaining much as we go along.

This question of disarmament is by no means a new subject. You ladies realize that arms are dangerous things to have around. The first disarmament meeting called by Abbott Charles Irn   de Saint Pierre in 1713 met with the objection "It can't be done," which was one of the chief arguments against the federation of the states of the Union. From then until the present international London convention, there have been many conferences, all leading toward complete disarmament, all of which makes particularly timely the question we are debating: That all nations should adopt a plan for complete disarmament,

except for such forces as are needed for police purposes. Once the nations decide to disarm, actual disarmament would be easily accomplished, much as was the case in the Philadelphia Convention when the Constitution of the United States was framed. The general scheme of accomplishment would be fairly easy.

The nations have two chief divisions of their military forces: the police division, well represented by the French divisions in the Rhineland, and those marking time and held ready for use in case of war. This last is represented by the bulk of the French navy and all the armies and navies today. It is this force resting dormant, doing nothing and used only in time of war, that we would abolish. Our proposal simply is that we discard those instruments and disband those troops not actually engaged in police protection, and it is such a program we are favoring this evening. We do not contend our plan will prove a panacea for all the ills of the world or bring into being a brotherhood of man, but we do believe it is desirable in this—that it will effect a better understanding between the people of the world, alleviate the causes for war and promote permanent peace. If we can show wherein it will do these things, we shall prove our case. It shall be my purpose to show that disarmament will tend to bring about world peace, save billions of dollars of money and millions of lives.

The figures in connection with the cost of war are so stupendous that they convey little meaning. The world war cost \$186,000,000,000. Let us take the cost in 1918 which was \$60,000,000 an hour. We can then roughly estimate five minutes' worth. Perhaps that can better be comprehended by the use of a couple of illustrations. The cost of war has increased at a tremendous rate. Consider the cost of a submarine as compared with that of a cattle boat. During the war I used to save every penny for war savings stamps. I did it from the time we entered the war until a few weeks after the Armistice was signed. When I was told I had accumulated enough to buy one soldier a helmet, I was impressed with the lavishness of this game of war.

And this is only the cost in dollars. The loss of human life and the misery caused by the war are more than we can comprehend: ten million killed, twenty million crippled or gassed, nine million orphans, five million widows. If those killed in the conflict could be lined up twenty abreast and marched past

a given point, it would take seventeen weeks to pass, or if added to the rank were the maimed, widows and orphans, four hundred sixteen days' marching twenty abreast, twenty-four hours, all day and all night would be required.

But these are simply the costs during war. Let us consider the cost of arms in times of peace. During 1929, France spent the equivalent of about four hundred fifty million dollars for the upkeep of her army and navy, an increase of one hundred million over the year previous; Italy spent almost three hundred million dollars; last August President Hoover announced that the United States during 1929 would spend for military purposes \$684,700,000, an increase of sixty million over 1928 and two hundred forty-four million in the four years just past. Ninety-three per cent of the total income of the United States and 90 per cent of the taxes collected throughout the world go to the upkeep of armies and navies.

Imagine what this total cost would do if diverted into industrial channels which would not cover the world with widows and orphans, which would save money in the elimination of 90 per cent of government expenses, halt the glorification of war and produce constructive works. It would cover twice the amount the United States spent on the Panama Canal and still leave a million for each of the gentlemen in the Negative, one million for Mr. Boutzer and two for me. It would provide a college education for every boy and girl in the United States. The cost of one battleship would endow one university and send one student to Europe for four years.

Think of what could be saved in man power and energy—what thirty million ablebodied men could do in the way of world progress in the lines of science and the advance of human thought and knowledge; what the engineers engaged in the construction of war implements and ships could do in the way of machinery for industry. Imagine the chemists and physicians now struggling to invent a more terrible poison gas with which to maim and kill people, all bending their energies for the cure of cancer or other diseases. The possibilities are so enormous as to make them seem visionary, and incline us to look askance. All we have to do is to decide internationally what we have already decided nationally—that it does not pay to fight. All that needs to be done is to cease preparing for war; quit talking about the glory of war and decide to lay down our arms. By no other single act could so much be accomplished.

We are here tonight in support of this proposition not simply because of the saving of the financial cost, but because of the saving of millions of lives and untold human misery as well. It would be the greatest step in world progress in the history of the world—an evolutionary and not a revolutionary step in human affairs which will place the people of this world in far better circumstances than they now enjoy. We of the Affirmative believe that disarmament would make world conditions better, would halt the glorification of war, and divert men and money into constructive work.

FIRST NEGATIVE

Wilbur Dutton, Colorado Teachers College

MR. CHAIRMAN, WORTHY OPPONENTS AND FRIENDS: It is indeed a pleasure to be debating this evening with our friends from California, the land of the lemon, the prune, the nut, and of great visions.

In order that we may all know exactly what the gentlemen from California are proposing we would like to have them tell us more about this "police protection" business. What forces are to be included under that head? Who is to determine what each nation will need for "police purposes"? How are the nations to reach an agreement in this matter? Also what arms do we now have in excess of our needs for police protection? We also wish they would discuss "What are arms?" If they would have the nations disarm, what would they have them discard?

Just what does this "complete disarmament" include? Will our friends abolish merchant ships? Surely they can quickly be transformed into fighting vessels. What about ship yards? They can be changed into navy yards. Will they stop the manufacture of airplanes? They can be turned into armament over night. How do the gentlemen from California propose to handle this question of "potential armaments," anyhow?

We believe there are two fundamental issues involved in this question: "Is disarmament desirable?" and "Is disarmament possible?" To both of these questions, we answer, "No." Disarmament is undesirable for political, economical and social reasons. Politically, arms offer, and have offered, the only

security we have for the maintenance of our sovereignty and independence. Economically, nations are so dependent upon each other for even the necessities of life that modern civilization could not be maintained without the protection of international trade. Socially, the world, rightly or wrongly, is committed to a policy of imperialism, the maintenance of which requires arms.

From the days when primitive man barricaded himself in his cave by piling stones at its entrance as a means of protection against his enemies, man has been dependent upon arms for his very existence. The primeval hunter, as he wandered through the forest in those distant ages, relied upon his club, spear and arrow for his personal safety and the safety of those dependent upon him. As the tribe and the clan followed in the orderly process of civilization, armed protection took on a communal rather than a personal aspect. However, arms existed and have always existed to give us that security which has been essential. As tribe and clan developed into the city and nation, arms increased proportionately in number, in effectiveness, and in orderly organization. All recognized their absolute dependence upon arms for their maintenance, their security, their position. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is so now. Security and position are the sole purposes for which arms exist today.

Our opponents may try to show you that arms have not given security, but any argument along that line is predicated upon a fallacy. We have but to look at the world's history to see that those nations, and only those nations, which have made adequate provision for armed protection have endured. Which nations in ancient or modern times have maintained inviolate their security and independence—those nations that have built up an adequate defense or those which have relied upon the goodwill of their neighbors? Look at China, at India, at the small states of Northern Africa, at Asia Minor and then let us ask ourselves if their weakness has not been due to a lack of effective armaments, the lack of an adequate provision for defense. Abyssinia, on the other hand, has steadily maintained her independence and she has done it because she has been ready to fight for that independence. Why have not such concessions as extraterritoriality been demanded of such countries as the United States, which is potentially far richer than China? Because China has been helpless before an armed Europe and the United States has made adequate protection against such demands.

The opposition would have all nations adopt the plan of the backward nations, which have been placed in an inferior position by lack of adequate arms. But even these nations are beginning to realize their mistake. They propose to take steps to place themselves on a level with the other nations of the world, and one of the first things they propose to do is to make provision for adequate self-protection by building up armaments. There is in India now a tremendous movement afoot to secure those rights and liberties which she feels have been taken away from her. We have but to view the modern history of the world to see that there are many instances where the subject nations have tried to rebel against superior forces to obtain privileges which they believed belong to them. We have but to look at the potential and numerical strength of those nations to realize what a predicament we would be in if we did away with our arms. We would simply be paving the way for the utter ruin of our civilization.

The world, rightly or wrongly, is committed to a policy of imperialism, the maintenance of which requires arms. Such a condition exists at the present time. We have imperialism. If we believe that imperialism is right and that the subject nations are rightly treated, we must maintain arms. If we believe imperialism is not desirable, the fact still remains that imperialism is here and that we have it and cannot do away with it, because those nations which are imperialistic will not agree to a plan of complete disarmament.

Now we come to the economic reason for the undesirability of disarmament. Probably the most marked characteristic at the present time is the world wide inter-dependence of nations. The trade routes of the nations have been scattered all over the world. These trade routes must be protected, and no nation would enter into any program which would not provide for this protection. Without battleships, cruisers, submarines and airplanes, these trade routes would be open to any kind of an attack. But we are told that if all nations were disarmed, our trade routes would be safe. We believe this is a fallacy. Piracy existed when the nations of the world were armed and if we now do away with our arms, the trade routes of the world will be open to attacks of all kinds.

We have heard a great deal about the cost of armaments. Of course, at the present time, when everything else is expen-

sive, arms are also expensive; but we contend that the cost of armaments is not disproportionate. In the United States, only five dollars is being spent per capita for armaments. That is not expensive insurance. Our opponent has tried to show us that this cost is unproductive. Let us consider the 250,000 now employed in our army and navy; also the thousands of our people who work to feed and clothe and make up and manufacture the things necessary for their existence. This is an economic item of no small importance.

Then again do away with arms and where would our security be? Five dollars per capita is the cost of that security. Is the cost excessive? Contemplate the holocaust which would follow the surrender of the only security and protection we have ever known, and then ask yourself if the cost is excessive.

Now let us take into consideration the social reasons for not having disarmament at the present time. Disarmament is but a fallacious attempt to hurry social evolution which alone can bring about a desirable disarmament. Past history has taught us that the progress of the nations has been brought about through a slow evolutionary process and not through a radical change such as our opponents advocate.

The world is not ready for disarmament. The causes of war still exist if, indeed, they are not increasing. Complete disarmament at the present time is not even desirable.

In conclusion, we believe disarmament is undesirable because of the political, economical and social situations. Disarmament is undesirable because: arms offer and have offered the only security for the maintenance of our sovereignty and independence; backward nations which resent being placed in an inferior position are a terrific menace to an unarmed civilization; and the world, rightly or wrongly, is committed to a policy of imperialism, the maintenance of which requires arms.

Economically disarmament is undesirable: First, because we need protection for our trade routes throughout the world; and Second, because of the present employment of thousands of people in our army and navy as well as thousands employed to take care of these men.

The social reasons for the undesirability of disarmament are: First, such a change would be revolutionary and not evolutionary which is the natural process, and finally, the time is not ripe for disarmament.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Gregson Boutzer, Southern California

FRIENDS: Mr. Dutton asked us what force constitutes police protection, how our policemen are to be operated and how many arms we have in excess of our needs for police protection. We wish we knew how many policemen we have in excess of those needed. We don't know. The point is that these questions will be decided. I will point out just how they are to be decided. There were certain problems and difficulties when our Constitution went into effect. As those problems and difficulties came up, they were met. So will the problems of disarmament be solved, and the difficulties ironed out. The question we have to decide is, is disarmament desirable? Our opponents say "No." We say "It is." They have asked us to consider the fact that a ship yard is a potential armament. I suppose a ship yard can be taken up and thrown against some other nation. They have also told us that a ship yard makes ships which in turn makes work. Mr. Jones said that we should abolish those instruments and disband those troops whose primary purpose it is to make war. Because our eye looks down the barrel of a gun, we don't consider it a potential armament. We don't advocate that we all pluck out our eyes. The primary purpose of our eyes is not to make war.

Our opponents have said that disarmament is undesirable because we would have no security under complete disarmament, and that backward nations are a menace to the world. We would have security under a plan of complete disarmament. Consider the future of a world completely disarmed; the backward nations would have no arms. Take for example Mr. Jones and me. If Mr. Jones and I had two guns, we could kill each other; if we threw away our guns, instead of killing each other, we would have to resort to words or the decision of a committee.

Then we have been asked how our trade routes would be protected. That is what our police protection is for. We ask for a plan of disarmament except for such forces as are needed for police protection. Our trade routes could be just as well protected under complete disarmament as now. We are only abolishing those idle armaments used only in case of war.

They tell us that socially disarmament should not be permitted, that it is a revolutionary process. We do not believe it. The first disarmament meeting was called by Abbott Charles Irn  e de Saint Pierre when a few men met and discussed the question. Ever since that time, we have had disarmament conferences continuing and showing that the process is evolutionary. But granting it is revolutionary. What of it? Have not a great many of our outstanding world reforms been revolutionary?

Now, is disarmament desirable? Mr. Dutton also made the point that 250,000 are now employed in our armies and navies and in constructing arms. He says that is production. Suppose we took these men out of the armies and navies and just kept our police protection. We would leave our security and disarm as to those men and instruments which are idle except in times of war. Suppose we have them build highways and universities. Is it not a better plan than having this so-called production, that we release this capital and energy into something constructive? They say \$5 per capita gives us our security. Ninety-three per cent of your taxes go to the armies and navies. Suppose we eliminated 93 per cent of this \$5 and still gave you your security, don't you think disarmament would be desirable? We contend that disarmament is desirable if it will promote peace—if it will alleviate the causes of war. It is obvious that international conflicts result almost entirely from armies on one hand and fear on the other, or suspicion and envy. We say that wars are the direct result of a vicious circle of fear, suspicion, envy, increasing armaments, increasing fear, suspicion, envy, increasing armaments. If we break one link of the chain, we break the chain, and as a result war will be impossible. This reasoning is sound.

During the first twenty-five years of our national life, Canada and the United States were belligerent enemies. We had in mind adding Canada to the Union, and Canada saw us as a possession of the British Empire. Then in 1812 the two nations decided to disarm and signed the Rush-Backet agreement. Since that time, not a shot has been fired across that border, although we will admit some have been carried across. Contrast this if you will with the border between France and Germany. War is the direct result of a vicious circle: armies, fear, suspicion, increased armies, more fear and more suspicion. Disarmament, we maintain, will alleviate the causes of war and

eliminate conflict between the nations. The countries would settle their disputes through civil tribunals. We will admit that these tribunals at first will be rather crude, but when we have eliminated trial by battle, these tribunals will improve as our courts have gradually improved until they dispense justice as well as is humanly possible. The groundwork for these tribunals is already laid. Hundreds of cases have been arbitrated during the twentieth century and the rules of procedure are being worked out as fast as possible.

Disarmament would promote peace because it is in accord with the hopes of the Master of mankind. Public opinion demands it. At the Paris conference, thirty-five nations, 85 per cent of the entire world, voted in favor of obligatory arbitration, agreeing to outlaw war. Every nation in the world has expressed itself as favoring peace. Ask the boys that were in the world war and they will tell you they never want to see it again. Mothers say arms should be outlawed. The dream of the brotherhood of man will never come true by being put in civilization's stocking some Christmas morning. It must be achieved by united effort on the part of the nations. Just as long as the countries of the world keep fearing, hating and distrusting their neighbors, just so long will peace on earth be impossible.

This plan of disarmament would improve world conditions, give us security, save billions of dollars and halt the glorification of war. It would divert men and money into constructive work.

We have shown disarmament is desirable because it will promote peace and alleviate the chief causes of war, and that it is in accord with the hopes of the Master of mankind.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Fred Litchman, Colorado Teachers College

FRIENDS: How my colleague ever found out I was from Missouri is more than I can understand. I have always taken great care to create the impression I was from Massachusetts. It seems that the signs of Missouri shine through the best kind of lives we can live. In Missouri, we have things they don't have in California. We have wonderful corn—twelve gallons to the acre.

We of the Negative contend that disarmament is undesirable. My colleague has shown you that. It is my part of this debate to carry on by showing that it is also impossible.

For the first time in history of the world, we find ourselves confronted by a problem worldwide in scope. Any kind of a problem involving the nations of the world must be dealt with by delegates from these nations. Such a conjunction constitutes an international board. Disarmament is an innovation. There is nothing upon which to build. We must admit that disarmament is a world wide problem and must be dealt with by an international board of some sort. This is the only possible solution of the problem which the world faces at the present time.

We of the Negative are firmly convinced that world disarmament is impossible because no plan which might be presented would prove feasible. All the nations of the world could not agree upon any specific type of international board to act as arbitrator, and even if such a board consummating disarmament were formed, it would not be able to carry out its judgments without the aid of force.

Our friends of the Affirmative have defined arms as the means of warfare. We do not and cannot agree. We must always have those potential arms which must be considered in spite of the fact they say arms are the means of warfare. They say the cost of arms constitutes the largest portion of our national budget. Arms are not so expensive. In the United States, we spend for cigars and cigarettes four hundred million dollars; for candy, two hundred fifty million dollars; for chewing gum, sixty one million dollars—a total of seven hundred sixteen million dollars, while the budget for 1930 of the United States shows \$670,000,000 for armaments. This compared to \$716,000,000 spent for candy, cigars and cigarettes, which are luxuries, gone as soon as we buy them, indicates we can spend the lesser amount of our security. At least the arms that be build this year will last ten years, which means that a battleship which is built at a cost of \$30,000,000 really costs but \$3,000,000 per year. They would tell us to disarm and throw all this in the scrap heap. Do you realize what that means? \$700,000,000 spent a year on arms, \$400,000,000 which we spend for support or \$300,000,000 per year left. In ten years we would have \$300,000,000 multiplied by ten or three billion dollars. They would have us go out and fill up the holes of the Atlantic with these armaments we have built for our protection. They say all

we have to do is to decide internationally that which has already been decided nationally. I protest. It has not been done nationally. It cannot be done internationally. What proof can the Affirmative bring to show that disarmament will be the means of freeing the world from war in the future? Disarmament cannot and will not insure us against war any time in the future.

As has been pointed out, this problem is world wide in scope. Suppose we try to picture an international board with the power of arbitration. How shall we elect delegates to this board? If by equal representation of all the nations, which seems the fairest way, the group would be far too large. Imagine a body as large as or larger than the United States Congress all with divergent ideas on the same subject. Imagine if you can the difficulty that would be encountered in trying to get them to agree on any one subject. Then suppose we allow the nations delegates according to population. This too would be too unwieldy and would give to the thickly populated countries advantages which smaller countries who are alert in their thinking would not agree to. Fancy the balance of power handed over to China and India. Suppose we allow delegates in accordance with the outlying possessions. This would prove as undesirable to some as the two previously mentioned. Disarmament by agreement involves the situations just mentioned and there is no possible way for the nations to come to an agreement whereby an international board could be formed. If we will but take a glance at the League of Nations or the World Court, we will be convinced that there is no plan that would be feasible.

Our opponents mentioned the fact that arbitration between nations has proved successful in the past. The reason for the success of these arbitrations has been the presence of arms. The League of Nations has been trying to formulate some plan whereby nations may disarm. They have arrived exactly nowhere.

Suppose we have disarmament, what then? We would have a board which could not function. This would be the only means of filling an unmistakable void. When we tear down an institution of long standing, we must have something to take its place just as when a building is torn down its site is an eyesore until something else is erected there. When a country the size of the United States, having the respect of the people, can-

not enforce the laws within its own boundaries, how can we expect a world policy board to enforce its judgments upon an unwilling world. It is very well to say we will do it by means of an economic boycott or some such means, but first, we must get the rest of the world to concentrate upon the boycott of the offending nation, and this board would have to have sovereignty in order to function competently. Suppose we do get the world to agree to boycott a nation. Let us imagine the United States is being placed under boycott. While the United States is almost entirely self-sufficient, many nations depend upon this country for their food supplies. Would such a boycott be upon the United States or upon the nations trying to effect the boycott? You must have unanimity of opinion. No matter what board you have, you must get the nations to agree. This board must have a tangible means of carrying out its decisions and this means must be a convincing show of arms. This would not be disarmament, but the concentration of the arms of the world under one head. Since this group could act only at the dictation of such persons as exercise the control, no nation which has developed a national spirit such as that of England or America could ever agree to submit its sovereignty to the jurisdiction of such a board. The board must have sovereignty to enforce its decisions. In the peace pacts, pledges and agreements which have taken place in recent years, we find an utter disregard for the rights of others, in spite of the fact that these agreements were apparently made in good faith. The trend of the London Conference today is along the lines of the Washington Conference. If the former agreements were successful, why is it necessary to do over again that which is supposed to have been accomplished?

Any international board would be entirely dependent upon some means of enforcing its decisions. It would resemble the judicial department of any nation. The judicial department of a government is confined solely to the rendering of decisions. These decisions would be useless if it were not for the enforcing department which we will call the police. These police as we know them, are armed. The main trouble with our judicial department at the present time, it is conceded, is that it is ruled by the money interests of the country. Just such a condition would exist in any kind of world board of intervention. The more wealthy and potentially powerful a nation, the less

likely it would be to enter into any agreement with the other nations. The United States has held aloof since the World War, and the other nations hate us for it. At the same time they fear us, not so much because of our present arms as because of the facilities and the potentialities which back these arms up. In the United States lies the greatest potential power of the world. This potential power must be taken into consideration. It is the force behind the armaments of the world. If the nations strong in potential power agree to disarm now, what is to prevent their arming again in a very short time? If the United States should disarm, she could completely arm herself again in six months. That is the opinion of Stephen Leacock, one of the leading thinkers and authorities on the subject.

In all the conferences of the past, all the nations of the world have failed to join. The United States would not consent to the League of Nations, and joined the World Court with reservations.

I have shown you that any plan for disarmament must necessarily rest upon an international basis and for that reason must fail, and that the administration of a disarmed world would be impossible.

I thank you.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Wilbur Dutton, Colorado Teachers College

We will agree with our opponents that if disarmament comes, old Santa Claus will have but little to do with it.

Mr. Boutzer rather avoided the question of police protection. We brought up that question for a specific purpose. He brought up the question of police protection and we would like to know what this police protection is doing at the present time, and what police protection is. The reason we want to know is that nearly all of our armaments are used for that police protection.

To show us what disarmament is, Mr. Boutzer brought up the idea of Canada and the United States as a specific example to be followed. Canada at the present time is under the rule of Great Britain. She has a governor sent from England, and her own courts, but she is responsible to England. Further-

more she maintains a considerable army and navy. We would like to know, if England had all the police protection she needs, what would prevent her using these armaments aggressively.

Let us consider the argument advanced by Mr. Jones as to the cost of war. We believe just as well as he does that war is a terrible thing, but we cannot get away from the facts and we must face the fact that we need armaments to protect us and give us security. He gave you the figures to prove the cost of war as 93 per cent or 90 per cent of our national taxes for past and future wars. The statistics given by Salvador de Madariaga report this cost as 73 per cent. However, even if 93 per cent, it is not excessive when compared with the cost of such a holocaust as would follow the surrender of the only security we have ever known.

Our opponents have given us a plan for the abolishing of the three causes of war; they have not told us how to overcome the other causes of war such as those given by Mr. Thomas Hawks of territorial expansion, and representation, and those given by Mr. Brown of the University of Columbia, such as ambitions of rulers, the pressure of overpopulated countries for new territory, and the ever increasing causes developed by the complications of civilization.

Mr. Boutzer suggested that public opinion is ripe for disarmament. Just what evidence has he for that statement? Has the Literary Digest held a poll on the subject? Arms are the only security we have for the maintenance of our sovereignty and independence. They have always been used by the nations as protection against piracy. I suppose our opponents would tell us we will have an international police force to back up the disarmament idea.

Our armaments are far from being a useless expense. They give us security. Property must be protected by a visual means and they give us this protection.

Our opponents are debating a plan for disarmament. The only plan they have put before you this evening is a plan of international organizations which would bring about arbitration. At the present time we have a League of Nations, a futile attempt at international agreement. They would advise that we form a few more leagues and say we are going to have international arbitration.

I thank you.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Glenn Jones, Southern California

There seem to be two or three outstanding disagreements upon the platform. The first is between Mr. Boutzer and myself. Mr. Boutzer, where did you get your knowledge of the Southern California women's complex of "hands off?"

We do not say disarmament is a cure all, but we do say it will improve world conditions. I should like to indicate a possibility. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof. Our international board would have to be endowed with powers that are necessary and proper. It might handle its cases as the Supreme Court has done after listening to the evidence.

In saying that arms are those instruments, the primary purpose of which is to make war, we are taking the popular and reasonable definition of arms. If we are going to define arms as anything which can be used in war or effect war, then obviously the seats and water glasses here are arms. They could be thrown at an enemy. Even a baby carriage is an armament.

The gentlemen have questioned us upon our figures that 90 per cent of the world's taxes go to finance past, present and future wars, and say Salvador, with an unpronounceable last name, says that only 73 per cent of the world's taxes go to arms. If only 50 per cent goes to armaments, the point is that this 50 per cent will be saved if we disarm. Mere figures do not make a great deal of difference. Ninety per cent, 73 per cent or 50 per cent is worth while to save if we can get security.

As to security, we did not say that arms do not give a certain amount of security. Absolutely they do, but if a nation is disarmed and all other nations are disarmed no nation can go to war, or they would be less able to go to war than at present. If the nations are completely armed, obviously they will be able to fight one another. Which situation gives

the most likelihood of our being killed, Mr. Boutzer and I in a dispute, fully armed, or both of us disarmed? The gentlemen have left out of their arguments the fact that all nations would be disarmed.

Summarizing: The nations would be better off under a plan of complete disarmament than at present. Our opponents have said that political, economic and social international difficulties stand in the way of disarmament. The argument that the time is not ripe is the argument that has been given against every reform throughout the ages. The time was not ripe for democratic government, for arbitration, for woman suffrage. It never will be ripe until the reform is adopted. We would disarm in order to make the time ripe for world peace, and if we adopt disarmament, we will gradually bring the people into such a position that the time will be ripe for world peace.

If disarmament would make the world better than at present, if it would improve world conditions in any respect, it should be adopted. Upon this ground we rest our case.

I thank you.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Fred Litchman, Colorado Teachers College

Our friends of the Affirmative have come here and told you that we should adopt a plan of complete disarmament. How shall we do it? We must know how to go about it. They have failed to tell you how they would administer a disarmed world.

We must take into consideration potential armaments. Mr. Jones has mentioned the fact that even a baby carriage is a potential armament. We cannot draw the line. That must be considered. Where do our armaments come from in this country? From our iron mines, our furnaces and workers used in making iron. That is one source. Then we must consider our industrial plants. We must consider our ship yards as other sources that produce armaments. They have argued that armaments are the causes of war and at another time they show armaments are only a means of war. They have neglec-

ted to answer the questions, "What is police protection?" "How shall we take care of potential armaments?"

Summarizing: First, Arms offer and have offered the only security we have for the maintenance of our sovereignty and independence. Let me give you a specific instance to prove that arms do offer security. I do not know the exact number, but several countries have tried to invade Abyssinia. What was the cause of the failure of these countries to conquer Abyssinia, for all countries who have tried have failed? Abyssinia was armed and able to maintain her sovereignty. I should like to ask the gentlemen of the Affirmative the reason Germany lost all her outlying possessions as soon as the world war was over. Germany had them; they did disappear. The main reason was that Germany had lost her armaments.

Second, Backward nations which resent being placed in an inferior position are a terrific menace to an unarmed civilization. These backward nations do not know what a disarmament plan means. They do not have delegates to these disarmament conferences.

Third, The world, rightly or wrongly, is committed to a policy of imperialism, the maintenance of which requires arms. Our friends have not mentioned the social aspect of the question. They have come here and argued that the nations of the world should adopt a plan of complete disarmament, but they have failed to tell us how we should adopt the plan, or how we would administer a disarmed world. That is a serious oversight. We might say the State of Colorado should adopt a plan for leveling the Rocky Mountains and promote the agricultural industry of this part of the country. That would make available millions of acres of land for farmers to till. If the State of Colorado should do this, is there anybody foolish enough to suggest a plan for doing it? The State of California should adopt a plan for eliminating earthquakes in California. It would save millions of dollars of damage every year, but is there anybody in California so foolish as to suggest a plan for the abolishing of earthquakes in California? The same may be said about disarmament. The problem is as momentous. If our friends could give us a plan for administering a disarmed world, they could win a \$20,000 prize. They would be doing more than the League of Nations has accomplished in twelve years.

As I have said, the gentlemen of the Affirmative have failed to offer an adequate plan for disarmament. Any plan they may suggest must necessarily rest upon an international basis and for that reason alone must fail. They have failed to show how disarmament could be made effective. Administration of a disarmed world would be impossible. My colleague has shown you disarmament is undesirable.

In conclusion: Disarmament is undesirable for three major reasons: political, economical, and social.

Politically, disarmament is undesirable: First, because arms offer and have offered the only security for the maintenance of our sovereignty and independence: Second, backward nations which resent being placed in an inferior position are a terrific menace to an unarmed civilization; and Third, the world, rightly or wrongly, is committed to a policy of imperialism, the maintenance of which requires arms.

Economically, disarmament is undesirable: First because of our need for protection of our trade routes all over the world; Second, because of the present employment of thousands of people in our army and navy as well as thousands employed to furnish supplies for these men.

Socially, disarmament is undesirable: First, because such a change would be revolutionary and not evolutionary, which is the natural process; and finally, the time is not ripe for disarmament.

I thank you.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Gregson Boutzer, Southern California

I want to examine with you the two principal contentions the Negative holds. The principal contention of Mr. Litchman is that disarmament is impossible. He asks if Colorado should adopt a plan of leveling its hills. If the benefits outweigh the detriments, this should be done, but there is too much cost involved; there are too many features that make it impossible to level off the hills. We will admit that California should adopt a plan for abolishing earthquakes but that is manifestly impossible. If it is impossible for the nations to disarm, then we have no case, but it is not. If Mr. Jones

and I are having a fist fight and we want to cut off our arms, we can. If the nations want to disarm, they can. The question is "Is disarmament more beneficial than detrimental?"

Mr. Litchman tells us the nations will not disarm. Our subject of debate is not whether they will disarm, but that they should adopt a plan of complete disarmament. We are trying to show where it would be more beneficial than detrimental.

According to Mr. Litchman, we have failed to point out how we would administer an unarmed world. We wish we knew that, but do you believe that the framers, when they began, knew the details of the Constitution of the United States? They had to be worked out. So did the details of a democratic government and of woman suffrage. If disarmament is desirable, then the difficulties, like those of every other constructive reform in the United States or in the world, can be worked out.

We have had some discussion about baby carriages being potential armaments. I guess we are going to find babies taking pot shots at one another pretty soon. We have to draw the line some place. If we should destroy everything in the world Mr. Litchman and Mr. Dutton define as potential armaments, we would have to cut off our fingers—we could pull a trigger, and our feet, we could kick somebody. We would have to destroy every bit of matter or life from the earth. It is all potential armaments. We are trying to debate the question whether the United States should or should not adopt a plan of disarmament. We believe we have given you a logical definition of arms—those instruments and troops whose primary purpose it is to make war. We are debating whether or not disarmament is more desirable or detrimental. We maintain the nations can disarm if they want to. If it is desirable, they can disarm.

Mr. Dutton says disarmament is undesirable—we would be insecure. We would have just as much security under a plan of complete disarmament as we have under a plan of a completely armed world, and our police would protect our trade routes.

As to this plan being revolutionary, ever since 1713 men have attempted disarmament. If we can improve world conditions, in any respect, if we can save one billion dollars and one million lives, we should adopt this plan.

Our plan means more than a world relieved of arms, it means a saving of billions of dollars and millions of men pre-

served from death and disability for life. Back of this plan for disarmament, we have the force of public opinion, a public opinion that demands security, that will have security, public opinion that will insure for us a just and lasting peace among ourselves and between all nations.

We have tried to show you that disarmament is more beneficial than detrimental and that disarmament will improve world conditions.

Thank you.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Disarmament: a select list of recent publications. (Reading list no. 23) 16p. mim. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Wash. D.C. '29.
- Jordan, D. S. or international peace; a list of books, reviews, and other articles, 1898 to 1927. 24p. Stanford Univ. Press. '27.
- Peace forces of today. mim. gratis. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Wash. D.C. '30.
- Publishers' Weekly. 116:2910-13. D. 28, '29. International cooperation for peace; compiled by the A.L.A. and the World Peace Foundation.
- United States. Library of Congress. Disarmament: with special reference to naval limitations; a bibliographical list. F. S. Hellman, comp. 40p. mim. Library. Wash. D.C. '29.
- United States. Library of Congress. League of Nations and disarmament: a bibliographical list. 18p. mim. D. 18, '29. (Obtainable only thru the Public Affairs Information Service. 11 W. 40th St. N.Y.)
- United States. Library of Congress. Russia's disarmament proposals: a bibliographical list. 6p. typew. 70c. D. 18, '29. (Obtainable only thru the Public Affairs Information Service. 11 W. 40th St. N.Y.)
- United States. Library of Congress. Russia's proposal for disarmament: a list of references. 4p. typew. 50c. (Obtainable only thru the Public Affairs Information Service. 11 W. 40th St. N.Y.) '29.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- American Academy of Political and Social Science. Present day causes of international friction and their elimination. 167p. pa. \$2. The Academy. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '29.

- American Academy of Political and Social Science. Some aspects of the present international situation. 204p. pa. \$2.
- The Academy.** Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '28.
- American Academy of Political and Social Science. United States in relation to the European situation. C. L. King, ed. (Annals. vol. 126. no. 215) vi, 177p. \$2.50. pa. \$2. The Academy. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '26.
- Anglo-French project for limitation of armament. (International Conciliation, no. 246) 83p. 5c. Carnegie Endowment. Division of intercourse and education. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y. '29.
- Bellairs, Carolyn. Naval conference and after. 47p. 1s. Faber and Faber. Lond. '30.
- Benda, Julien. The treason of the intellectuals. 244p. \$2.50. William Morrow. N.Y. '28.
- Boeckel, F. B. Between war and peace. 591p. \$2.50 Macmillan. N.Y. '28.
- Brewster, H. W. Madness of war. 261p. \$2. Harper. N.Y. '28.
- Brooks-Bright Foundation. Brooks-Bright prize essays, 1929. What is the psychological effect of the national mind of great armed forces maintained ostensibly for national defense? 143p. \$1. The Foundation. N.Y. '29.
- Buell, R. L. Europe, a history of ten years. new. ed. rev. vii, 452p. \$2.50. college ed. \$2. Macmillan. N.Y. '28.
- Buell, R. L. International relations. 2d rev. ed. vii, 452p. \$5. students' ed. Henry Holt. N.Y. '29.
- Bullard, Arthur. American diplomacy in the modern world. vi, 10-127p. \$1.50. Univ. of Pa. Press. '28.
- Butler, N. M. Annual report, 1928, of the Director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of intercourse and education. 93p. Carnegie Endowment. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y. '29.
- Clemenceau, G. E. B. Grandeur and misery of victory. 5-432p. \$5. Harcourt, Brace. N.Y. '30.
- Davie, M. R. Evolution of war. 391p. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '29.
- Donaldson, John. International economic relations. 674p. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '28.
- Edwards, W. H. Heading for war. 5-162p. \$1.50. Payson and Clarke. (now Brewer and Warren) N.Y. '28.

- Gerould, J. T., comp. Selected articles on the Pact of Paris. (Handbook Series III. vol. 1) 287p. \$2.40. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '29.
- Gowen, H. H. and others. Problems in international understanding. 199p. Univ. of Washington Book Store. Seattle. '28.
- Harris, H. W. Naval disarmament. 124p. 3s6d. George Allen and Unwin. Lond. '30.
- Howard-Ellis, Charles. Origin, structure and working of the League of Nations. 528p. \$7. Houghton Mifflin. N.Y. '28.
- Ichihashi, Yamato. Washington conference and after. xii,443p. \$4. Stanford Univ. Press. '28.
- Institute of International Relations. Problems of peace; 1st-3d series. 3 vols. 1st, \$4.25. 2d, 3d, each \$3.50. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '27-'29.
- Jeze, G. and Truchy, H. War finance of France. 344p. Yale Univ. Press. New Haven. '27.
- Johnsen, Julia E., comp. Disarmament. (Reference Shelf. vol. VI. no. 6) 173p. 90c. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '30.
- Johnsen, Julia E., comp. Selected articles on national defense. (Handbook Series II. vol. 6) 469p. \$2.40. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '28.
- Kenworthy, J. M. Peace or war? 338p. \$2.50. Boni and Liveright. N.Y. '27.
- Latimer, Hugh. Naval disarmament: a brief record of the Washington conference to date. (Chatham House monographs no. 3) 112p. 3s6d. Royal Institute of International Affairs. Lond. '30.
- League of Nations. Armaments year book, 1928-1929: general and statistical information. 1084p. \$5. World Peace Foundation. Bost. Ja. '29.
- League of Nations. Assembly, 8th, 1927. Reduction of armaments; arbitration, security, disarmament and work of the Preparatory committee for the Disarmament conference. 5c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '27.
- League of Nations. Committee on arbitration and security. Report of the Committee on the work of its 3d session, held at Geneva, June 27-July 4, 1928. pa. 60c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '29.

- League of Nations. Financial committee. Budget expenditure on national defence, 1913, 1920-1922. 60c. 1921-1923. \$1. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '22-'23.
- League of Nations. Preparatory committee for the Disarmament conference. Documents, series 8. Minutes of the 6th session, first part. pa. \$2. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '29.
- League of Nations. Secretariat. Information section. Reduction of armaments and the organization of peace. rev. ed. pa. 25c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- League of Nations. Statistical inquiry into national armaments. 2 vols. \$1.60. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '23.
- Limitation of naval armaments; records of the Conference for the limitation of naval armament held at Geneva, Switzerland, from June 20 to August 4, 1927. 220p. United States. Govt. Ptg. Off. Wash. D.C. '28.
- London naval conference. 31p. Foreign Policy Association, Inc. N.Y. '29.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. Disarmament. xiii,379p. \$5. Coward-McCann. N.Y. '29.
- Martin, C. E. Politics of peace. (Standard books in world politics) 458p. \$4. Stanford Univ. Press. '29.
- Moore, Frederick. America's naval challenge. 166p. \$1.50. Macmillan. N.Y. '29.
- Murray, Gilbert. Ordeal of this generation. ix,276p. \$3. Harper. N.Y. '29.
- Norwood, F. W. Disarmament: the desire and fear of nations. (John Clifford lecture for 1928) 43p. 6d. Brotherhood Movement. 37 Norfolk St. Lond. W. C. 2. '28.
- Reely, M. K., comp. Selected articles on disarmament. (Handbook Series) \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '21.
- Richmond, H. W. National policy and naval strength, and other essays. xviii,355p. \$6. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '28.
- Shillock, J. C., jr. Post-war movements to reduce naval armaments. 92p. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Division of intercourse and education. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y. '28.
- Shotwell, J. T. Pact of Paris. 96p. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Division of intercourse and education. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y. '28.

- Shotwell, J. T. War as an instrument of national policy and its renunciation in the Pact of Paris. 310p. \$3.50. Harcourt, Brace. N.Y. '28.
- Smith, F. B. Must we have war? xxi,318p. \$2.50. Harper. N.Y. '29.
- United States. Department of State. London naval conference: speeches and press statements of the American delegation, January 20th-April 29th, 1930. (Conference series, no. 3) 15c. Supt. of Documents. Wash. D.C. '30.

PERIODICALS

- American Economic Review. 16:1-13. Mr. '26. Economics and war. A. A. Young.
- American Journal of International Law. 24:58-64. Ja. '30. Nationality: *jus soli* or *jus sanguinis*. J. B. Scott.
- American Journal of International Law. 24:118-22. Ja. '30. Progress of cooperative defense. C. G. Fenwick.
- American Journal of International Law. 24:228-40. Ap. '30. Camouflage in the peace movement. D. J. Hill.
- American Mercury. 7:202-5. F. '26. Defense in modern war. E. L. M. Burns.
- American Mercury. 11:385-92. Ag. '27. In praise of war. A. B. Conway.
- American Mercury. 16:223-32. F. '29. Making of modern armies. Elbridge Colby.
- American Mercury. 18:22-4. S. '29. Editorial. H. L. Mencken.
- American Society of International Law. Proceedings. 1929:1-13. Institutions of peace. C. E. Hughes.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 120:65-6. Jl. '25. Possibility of disarmament, necessity for United States cooperation. H. T. Allen.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 120:81-6. Jl. '25. Is disarmament possible? A. D. Call.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 138:1-181. Jl. '28. Some aspects of the present international situation. ed. by C. L. King.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 143:230-48. My. '29. Women in international affairs. F. B. Boeckel.

- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:1-150. Jl. '29. Present day causes of international friction and their elimination.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:37-9. Jl. '29. Arbitration of differences at conferences on reduction and limitation of armaments. T. P. Magruder.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 144:137-50. Jl. '29. Reduction and limitation of armaments. T. P. Magruder and others.
- Atlantic Monthly. 143:116-22. Ja. '29. Peace on earth, and the U.S.A. William Martin.
- Atlantic Monthly. 143:525-38. Ap. '29. Disarmament, American plan. Salvador de Madariaga.
- Century. 112:24-31. My. '26. Arms and the world. J. T. Shotwell.
- Century. 113:513-22. Mr. '27. Our crumbling national defense. H. J. Reilly.
- Christian Century. 47:650-2. My. 21, '30. World's greatest problem; how to get along with one another. W. G. Everson.
- Collier's. 84:10-11. O. 19, '29. War, perfect war. W. G. Shepherd.
- Collier's. 84:10-11. D. 7, '29. Bigger guns or better homes? W. E. Borah.
- Collier's. 85:66. Ja. 18, '30. We put our heads together.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 126:2079. Ap. 7, '28. Urges American bankers to refuse loans to countries which are not disarming. R. de Hegedus.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 130:551-4. Ap. 25, '30. Speeches of King George V, Secretary of State Stimson, Premier MacDonald, and others.
- Commonweal. 10:349. Ag. 7, '29. Guns, treaties, taxes.
- Commonweal. 10:634-5. O. 23, '29. Economic disarmament. John Carter.
- Communist. 9:231-5, 336-49. Mr.-Ap. '30. Political background of the London conference. Leon Platt.
- Conference Board Bulletin. 39:314-15. Mr. '30. War cost in peace time.
- Congressional Digest. 8:225-51. O. '29. Limitation of naval armaments; with pro and con discussion.

- Congressional Digest. 8:241. O. '29. Great Britain's position on the disarmament problem; speech before the League of Nations at Geneva September 3, 1929. J. R. MacDonald.
- Contemporary Review. 128:592-600. N. '25. Combative instinct and the abolition of war. A. T. Cadoux.
- Contemporary Review. 130:46-53. Jl. '26. Study of war. George Ashton.
- Contemporary Review. 132:237-49. Ag. '27. Naval disarmament. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 132:373-85. S. '27. Naval limitations conference. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 132:687-93. D. '27. Disarmament by example. A. A. Ponsonby.
- Contemporary Review. 133:101-6. Ja. '28. Disarmament and security. Jacques Kayser.
- Contemporary Review. 133:289-93. Mr. '28. Security, disarmament and America.
- Contemporary Review. 133:572-9. My. '28. Will disarmament come? H. W. Harris.
- Contemporary Review. 133:651-6. My. '28. League and disarmament. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 136:649-55. N. '29. MacDonald-Hoover conversations. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 137:198-205. F. '30. Paradoxes and peace. A. R. Fry.
- Current History. 26:73-8. Ap. '27. Naval powers' reception of the American proposal; with texts and replies. J. T. Gerould.
- Current History. 26:86-92. Ap. '27. America misled by Five-power naval treaty. T. S. Butler.
- Current History. 26:269-73. My. '27. Text of American disarmament memorandum.
- Current History. 27:565-9. Ja. '28. British attitude on disarmament and sea power. J. T. Gerould.
- Current History. 28:77-80. Ap. '28. Challenge, and menace, of the nationalistic spirit. Leo Gershoy.
- Current History. 30:181-8. My. '29. Nationalism aflame throughout the world. Nicholas Roosevelt.
- Current History. 30:483-9. Jl. '29. America's reduction proposals revitalize disarmament discussion; with text of H. S. Gibson's speech. J. T. Gerould.

- Current History. 30:1024-9. S. '29. Disarmament alone no guaranty of world peace. J. T. Shotwell.
- Current History. 31:49-52. O. '29. Main factors of disarmament. P. M. Brown.
- Current History. 31:182-3. O. '29. Denmark's disarmament program. J. H. Wuorinen.
- Current History. 31:317-21. N. '29. Disunited states of Europe. A. B. Hart.
- Current History. 31:711-17. Ja. '30. Naval reduction: what it means in money. B. L. French.
- Current History. 32:286-9. My. '30. Rebirth of disarmed Germany. G. M. McClellan.
- Current History. 32:441-60. Je. '30. London naval conference.
- Economist. 109:sup. 1-8. O. 19, '29. Armaments expenditure of the world. P. Jacobsen.
- Economist. 109:700-1. O. 19, '29. Disarmament factors.
- Economist. 110:980-1. My. 3, '30. Peace and population.
- Educational Research Reports. p.273-85. Ap. 8, '29. (price on application) Efforts toward disarmament.
- Educational Research Reports. p.39-56. Ja. 16, '30. (price on application) London naval conference. G. B. Galloway.
- Engineering. 129:111-13. Ja. 24, '30. Problem of cruiser and destroyer limitation.
- Foreign Affairs. 6:357-67. Ap. '28. American responsibilities for peace. Viscount Cecil.
- Foreign Affairs. 6:459-67. Ap. '28. Alternatives for war. J. T. Shotwell.
- Foreign Affairs. 7:427-38. Ap. '29. Biology and war. A. M. Carr-Saunders.
- Foreign Policy Association. Information Service. 5:174-92. Jl. 24, '29. Anglo-American naval understanding.
- Foreign Policy Association. Information Service. 6:19-35. Ap. 2, '30. Limitation of land armaments. David Woodward.
- Foreign Policy Association. Information Service. 6:101-30. My. 28, '30. London naval conference, January 21—April 22, 1930. W. T. Stone.
- Fortnightly Review. 123:737-49. Je. '25. France, Hindenburg and peace. John Bell.
- Fortnightly Review. 124:745-54. D. '25. Security and disarmament.
- Fortnightly Review. 125:315-26. Mr. '26. Is disarmament possible? H. F. Spender.

- Fortnightly Review. 127:364-75. Mr. '27. America's increasing armaments.
- Fortnightly Review. 127:610-17. My. '27. Difficulties of disarmament. H. F. Spender.
- Fortnightly Review. 132:132-4. Jl. '29. Arms or friendship? Amicus.
- Fortnightly Review. 132:676-84. N. '29. Reflections from Geneva. H. F. Spender.
- Fortnightly Review. 133:751-60. Je. '30. Main issue in disarmament. J. H. Harley.
- Fortnightly Review. 133:785-96. Je. '30. Psychology of peace. W. H. Carter.
- Forum. 73:632-48. My. '25. Shall America arm? a debate, W. L. Rodgers; T. H. Bliss. 73:915-21. Je. '25. Discussion.
- Forum. 81:70-7. sup.46. F.-Mr. '29. Should America disarm? Kirby Page; B. A. Fiske.
- Good Housekeeping. 86:65. Ap. '28. Let us have no more war.
- Harper's Magazine. 151:129-38. Jl. '25. Limitation of armaments; uncensored statement. B. A. Fiske.
- Harper's Magazine. 154:141-7. Ja. '27. Gentlemen prefer wars. I. A. R. Wylie.
- Harper's Magazine. 155:291-301. Ag. '27. Psychology of nationalism. F. H. Allport.
- Harper's Magazine. 158:133-43. Ja. '29. Bigger and better armaments. C. A. Beard.
- Harper's Magazine. 158:320-30. F. '29. Prospects for peace. C. A. Beard.
- International Conciliation. 208:79-84. Mr. '25. Plans and protocols to end war; historical outline and guide. J. T. Shotwell.
- International Conciliation. 212:225-63. S. '25. European security; addresses. Edward Benes; A. Chamberlain; J. R. MacDonald.
- International Conciliation. 220:247-92. My. '26. Disarmament and American foreign policy.
- International Conciliation. 224:487-98. N. '26. Moral equivalent of war. William James.
- International Conciliation. 242:414-35. S. '28. Cooperation against war through the League of Nations.
- International Journal of Ethics. 39:385-407. Jl. '29. National-mindedness and international-mindedness. G. H. Mead.

- Labour Monthly. 12:305-15. My. '30. War and the national question: an answer to P. Kiyevsky. M. Lenin.
- Ladies' Home Journal. 45:8-9. Ap. 12-13. My. '28. What price peace? Kathleen Norris.
- Ladies' Home Journal. 46:3-4. My. '29. Promoting peace through limitation of armaments. Calvin Coolidge.
- Literary Digest. 92:12-13. Ja. 15, '27. Moral disarmament.
- Literary Digest. 92:20. Mr. 19, '27. Irish view of disarmament.
- Literary Digest. 94:20. S. 17, '27. Mechanized army of future war.
- Literary Digest. 99:18-19. D. 8, '28. German general on disarmament.
- Literary Digest. 101:8-9. Je. 29, '29. Human nature disarmament plan; Dawes speech.
- Literary Digest. 103:14-15. O. 19, '29. What is the United States of Europe?
- Literary Digest. 103:7. D. 28, '29. War's bite of the taxpayer's dollar.
- Living Age. 323:679-82. D. 27, '24. How shall we disarm?
- Living Age. 329:309-10. My. 8, '26. Washington's warning. M. Miller-Jabusch.
- Living Age. 334:492-8. Mr. 15, '28. Alliances and security. William Martin.
- Living Age. 335:167-8. N. '28. Disarmament, the next great problem.
- Living Age. 336:158. Ap. '29. War and peace; conflicting views.
- Living Age. 337:74-83. S. 15, '29. Minds across the sea; world peace via Anglo-American understanding. H. W. Steed.
- Living Age. 337:288-9. N. 1, '29. Army of the future; war and peace. Hans von Seeckt.
- Living Age. 337:332-7. N. 15, '29. Pacifism in high places. L. J. Maxse.
- Living Age. 338:388-97. Je 1, '30. Strategies of peace.
- Living Age. 338:536-40. Jl 1, '30. From Washington to London. Jacques Bardoux.
- Nation. 126:438-42. Ap. 18, '28. Russia wants to disarm! M. Litvinov.
- Nation. 127:335. O. 10, '28. Fighting against disarmament.

- Nation. 128:304-5. Mr. 13, '29. Myth of disarmament. A. E. Johnson.
- Nation. 129:84-5. Jl. 24, '29. Prosperity. Zechariah Chafee, jr.
- Nation. 129:132. Ag. 7, '29. Peace pact and disarmament.
- Nation. 129:290. S. 18, '29. Much ado about disarmament.
- Nation. 130:122-3. Ja. 29, '30. Dollars and ships at London.
- Nation and the Athenaeum. 46:553-60. Ja. 18, '30. Naval conference supplement.
- Nation and the Athenaeum. 46:754-5. Mr. 8, '30. Will America outlaw war?
- Nation and the Athenaeum. 47:103-5. Ap. 26, '30. Balance-sheet of the conference.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1925:772-5. Safeguarding peace. F. L. Beals.
- New Republic. 51:114-16. Je. 22, '27. Disarmament, a warning.
- New Republic. 54:262-7. Ap. 18, '28. Paradox of peace. R. G. Tugwell.
- New Republic. 59:113-14. Je. 19, '29. MacDonald and Hoover.
- New Republic. 60:162-3. O. 2, '29. Can armaments be reduced?
- New Republic. 61:70. D. 11, '29. Conscription of wealth.
- New Republic. 61:132-4. D. 25, '29. Abolish the battleship! H. N. Brailsford.
- New Republic. 61:329-30. F. 12, '30. Can battleships be abolished now? Roy Veatch.
- New Republic. 62:3-5. F. 19, '30. America blocks disarmament.
- New Republic. 62:5-6. F. 19, '30. ABC of hate; international hatred is fostered in the public schools.
- New Republic. 62:130. Mr. 19, '30. Should America be included? reply to ABC of hate. J. H. Robinson.
- New Statesman. 33:732-3. S. 28, '29. Arms and men.
- New Statesman. 34:830-2. Ap. 5, '30. Two doctrines of peace. S. Huddleston.
- 19th Century and After. 99:580-9. Ap. '26. Myths of war: the so-called atrocities of history. F. J. P. Veate.
- 19th Century and After. 99:630-41. My. '26. Disarmament and the British navy. G. Ashton.
- 19th Century and After. 99:779-80. My. '26. Myths of war; reply. Edward Anderson.
- 19th Century and After. 100:148-57. Jl. '26. Myths of war; reply. A. G. Baird.

- 19th Century and After. 100:481-96. O. '26. Progress of war. J. F. C. Fuller.
- 19th Century and After. 101:678-84. My. '27. On laws governing the use of armed force. R. Custance.
- 19th Century and After. 103:577-89. My. '28. Soviet and disarmament at Geneva. F. G. Stone.
- 19th Century and After. 104:650-8. N. '28. Elimination of war. J. F. C. Fuller.
- 19th Century and After. 104:766-76. D. '28. Sublimation of war. A. G. B. Smith.
- 19th Century and After. 107:179-88. F. '30. Future of sea power: a speculation. M. F. Talbot.
- 19th Century and After. 107:754-62. Je. '30. Naval treaty. H. Sidebotham.
- North American Review. 221:665-79. Je. '25. Protocol, security, and disarmament. A. L. P. Dennis.
- North American Review. 222:209-25. D. '25. Next conference on disarmament. J. M. Kenworthy; A. W. Hinds.
- North American Review. 223:216-33. Je. '26. Reduction of armaments. W. H. Gardiner.
- North American Review. 228:399-404. O. '29. War against war. J. G. Harbord.
- Outlook and Independent. 154:485-7. Mr. 26, '30. Birth control or war? H. K. Norton.
- Quarterly Review. 249:81-99. Jl. '27. Problem of disarmament. L. Villari.
- Quarterly Review. 254:209-17. Ap. '30. Predominant surface ship.
- Quarterly Review. 254:258-77. Ap. '30. America's bid for world trade. I. Phayre.
- Review of Reviews. 75:617-24. Je. '27. Debts, disarmament, and economics. F. H. Simonds.
- Review of Reviews. 76:641. D. '27. Other side of disarmament.
- Review of Reviews. 77:69-76. Ja. '28. Is Europe headed for war? F. H. Simonds.
- Review of Reviews. 77:418-20. Ap. '28. American policy of preventing war.
- Review of Reviews. 79:51. My. '29. Disarmament again.
- Review of Reviews. 80:73-4. Ag. '29. Disarmament. L. V. Gordon.

- Round Table. 19:447-64. Je. '29. Naval disarmament.
- Round Table. 19:677-91. S. '29. Fresh start in international affairs.
- Round Table. 20:217-41. Mr. '30. Where are we going?
- Saturday Evening Post. 200:21. Ag. 3, '29. New road to disarmament; interview with Ramsay MacDonald. I. F. Marcossou.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:28. My. 24, '30. Disarmament.
- Saturday Review. 148:150. Ag. 10, '29. Disarmament: what America thinks.
- Saturday Review of Literature. 6:865-6. Mr. 29, '30. War and society. Norman Angell.
- School and Society. 31:355-8. Mr. 15, '30. World peace and the college. G. E. Snavely.
- Scribner's Magazine. 82:357-61. S. '27. Population pressure and war. E. A. Ross.
- Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly. 10:279-89. D. '29. International regulation of national action for self-defense. P. B. Potter.
- Spectator. 143:429-30. O. 5, '29. American view of naval reduction, based on America's naval challenge. Frederick Moore.
- United States Naval Institute Proceedings. 55:751-64. S. '29. Disarmament and the national defense. W. V. Pratt.
- World Today. 55:108-11. Ja. '30. President Hoover and the naval conference.
- World Tomorrow. 12:464-6. N. '29. Our mobilized war machine. D. Allen.
- World Tomorrow. 12:524-5. D. '29. Outlawry of war as a menace to the peace movement. M. S. Stewart.
- World Tomorrow. 13:197. My. '30. Disarmament in toto.
- World Tomorrow. 13:244. Je. '30. Will the peace movement move?
- World Tomorrow. 13:248-50. Je. '30. Next ten years of the League. R. L. Buell.
- World Unity. 4:21-39. Ap. '29. Disarmament: the yet unsolved problem of international peace. F. B. Clark.
- World's Work. 51:465-6. Mr. '26. Will disarmament produce world peace?
- World's Work. 53:615-25. Ap. '27. Where the next world war will start; Asia is a fever spot which threatens peace.

- World's Work. 55:427-32. F. '28. Hunger as a cause of war.
H. K. Norton.
- World's Work. 59:58-61. Jl. '30. Continuous instead of spas-
modic naval parleys. William Hard.
- Yale Review. 15:625-44. Jl. '26. Limitation of armaments.
E. M. Blanchard.
- Yale Review. 17:263-80. Ja. '28. Geneva naval conference.
Richard Hooker.
- Yale Review. 19:649-67. Je. '30. Armament and its future use.
B. H. Liddell Hart.

CHAPTER V

ONTARIO SYSTEM OF LIQUOR
CONTROL

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

versus

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: *That the several states should be allowed to adopt the Ontario system of liquor control.*

This is a stenographic report of the debate between an Affirmative team representing the University of Wisconsin, and a Negative team for Ohio State University, which took place in Bascom Theatre, Madison, Wisconsin, on the night of March 20, 1930. The decision, for the Affirmative, was rendered by a critic judge, Professor Alan H. Monroe of Purdue University. The report of this debate was secured thru the services of Professor H. L. Ewbank, Associate Professor of Speech, University of Wisconsin.

BRIEF

ONTARIO SYSTEM OF LIQUOR CONTROL

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION :

- A. The present situation is a menace to American welfare and security.
 - 1. We have had prohibition over ten years and yet efforts to enforce it have failed.
- B. The Affirmative plan proposes to return the regulation of liquor traffic to the states.
 - 1. The states that are inherently dry may have prohibition if they want it.
 - 2. For wet states the Ontario system of liquor control is favored.
 - a. This plan is not a return to the old time saloon.
- I. National prohibition is inherently wrong.
 - A. It took a matter that was for state legislation and made it a matter of national legislation.
 - 1. Prior to prohibition thirty-three of the states were successfully enforcing their own dry laws.
 - a. This is the testimony of
 - (1) Mr. Archibald Stevenson in his book, *States Rights and Prohibition*.
 - (2) Mr. David Colvin, noted authority on prohibition, and editor of *Prohibition in the United States*.
 - (a) He points out that state legislation was highly successful, especially after the passage of the Webb-Kenyon Act in 1913.
 - b. In 1908, Mr. J. Cuddy, president of the Kansas Temperance Union stated that

- (1) All over Kansas the enforcement of the state law had decreased crime and made police protection almost unnecessary.
 - (2) Seventy counties had remained dry during the entire period of the prohibitory law.
2. This success was due to realization of the varied conditions and interests of the people living in the several states.
 - a. A law desirable for one section of the country was not considered necessarily desirable for another.
 - b. States like New York and Wisconsin have as much right to be wet as states like Kansas or Texas have to be dry.
 - B. It disregards the fact that a law to be enforced must have the sanction of the customs and habits of a people.
 1. There is no general consensus of opinion that drinking is wrong.
 - a. People will obey laws against murder or larceny because they consider the evils aimed at wrong in themselves.
 - (1) A man who violates the prohibition law does not feel he is doing wrong.
 2. A minority cannot force such a law upon the majority.
 - a. There is no majesty or sanctity to a law that does not express the beliefs of the people.
 3. To continue to try to enforce the law will lead to nothing but disrespect for law and internal strife.
- II. Prohibition has proved an absolute failure.
- A. The entire United States has become a house divided against itself.
 1. The wet states are opposing the control of a centralized government.
 - a. Montana, Nevada, New York and Wisconsin have expressed open resentment against the eighteenth amendment by repealing their state dry laws.

- b. Connecticut and Rhode Island originally declined to ratify the eighteenth amendment.
 - c. Maryland refused to pass a state act.
 - d. North Dakota came within 2 per cent of repealing its state law in 1928.
 - (1) It was a bone dry state for forty years.
 - e. Delaware, in the same year, voted eight to one in favor of a change in the amendment.
 - f. In 1928 Massachusetts voted against federal enforcement by an overwhelming majority.
 - (1) It had adopted a state law in 1924.
 - 2. Their resentment has in many instances undone the gains the dry states have made.
 - a. Kansas under federal prohibition is as wet as any state in the Union.
- B. There is a rising tide of resentment against our farce of federal enforcement of prohibition.
 - 1. Many leaders of social, economic or political thought have allied themselves with the Association against the Prohibition Amendment.
 - 2. Nation-wide organizations of women have been formed against it.
 - 3. Voluntary committees of lawyers have been organized in various large cities.
 - 4. The Literary Digest's prohibition poll showed 412,000 votes in favor of modification or repeal, as against 191,000 who voted for continued enforcement.
- C. The concrete results of prohibition are unfavorable.
 - 1. Arrests for drunkenness have increased under prohibition from 279,000 in 1920 to 668,000 in 1929.
 - a. Under state control of liquor in Canada drunkenness had decreased 50 per cent.
 - 2. According to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, deaths from alcoholism in 1929 were almost six times as numerous as in 1920.
 - a. In Canada in 1929, there were only eleven alcoholic deaths among one-and-one-fourth millions of insured Canadians.

3. Crime has increased greatly under prohibition.
 - a. Our 1929 state and federal prison population was 96,125 as compared with 68,000 in 1915.
 - b. Prohibition has greatly increased the problem of law enforcement.
4. Our present law is responsible for an orgy of graft and corruption such as our country has never before experienced.
 - a. The possibility of enormous profits has been responsible for the growth of huge underworld rings that have forced their way into politics by bribery and coercion.
 - (1) There are more than eight hundred gangs at work in this country under prohibition.
 - (2) Al Capone, the head of one of them, only admitted its gross income in 1927 to be seventy million dollars.
 - b. Federal and local agents are offered huge sums to keep their hands off alcohol plants and transportation of liquor.
 - c. Other large cities are not far behind Chicago in the matter of gang wars and crime.
5. Last year, the Federal government spent over \$50,000,000 in attempted enforcement of the prohibition law and seized thirty-two million gallons of liquor.
 - a. These efforts failed even to perturb the bootlegger industry.

III. The Ontario system of liquor control will be an effective substitute for prohibition.

- A. It is working in Ontario today after ten years of prohibition had failed.
 1. All hard liquors are sold by the government thru government owned and operated liquor stores.
 - a. The large-scale bootlegger has disappeared.
 - (1) One thousand small stills were discovered in Ontario last year, as against 32,000 speakeasies in New York alone.
 2. Each customer buys a permit issued by the government.
 - a. This an open record of his purchases.

- b. As soon as purchases are excessive, he is refused further sales and his permit is cancelled.
 3. Dispensary premises are clean and orderly.
 - a. There is no loitering or drinking done.
 - b. Drinking of hard liquor is not tolerated in public places.
 4. Liquor is not advertised on signs or billboards.
 5. Stores are opened and closed at set times, and are closed on all holidays and election days.
 6. The government supervises all shipments from distilleries to the stores.
 7. The books of brewers and distilleries are open at all times to public inspection.
 8. Hard drinking is punished by severe sentences and cancellation of permits.
- B. It has the endorsement of the people.
 1. Every province in Canada except Prince Edward Island has turned from prohibition to liquor control.
 2. In 1929 Ontario endorsed its action of 1926 by returning Premier Ferguson to office by a two to one vote over his prohibition rival.
 3. Since government control, there has been a decrease in arrests for all causes of 50 per cent, and for drunkenness of 60 per cent.
 4. The Ontario Liquor Board report for 1928 shows a reduction in the consumption of distilled liquor in Ontario, as between 1915 and 1928, of 2,589,000 gallons.
 5. Judge Emerson Coatsworth of the Toronto City Court heartily endorses the system of government control.
 - a. He says "There are convictions in my court where there were formerly acquittals."
 6. Dr. C. J. Decker, superintendent of the Toronto Public Receiving Hospital, reports the number of motor accidents greatly reduced under government control.
- IV. The Negative do not ask the states where the sentiment is dry to adopt government control.

- A. It is the only system, however, that will enable wet states to get back their respect for law and order.
- B. Thirty-three states of the United States were reasonably dry before prohibition.

NEGATIVE

- I. Prohibition has come about as the result of a long process of gradual development.
 - A. It was first introduced into this country nearly three centuries ago.
 - 1. At that time, Connecticut prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquor to the Indians.
 - a. By 1700 all the states had similar laws.
 - B. In 1933 Georgia adopted local option laws.
 - a. Other states followed her example.
 - C. By 1817, thirty-three states had total prohibition.
 - D. Forty-six out of forty-eight states ratified the prohibition amendment.
 - 1. This was the largest majority ever given any amendment to our Constitution.
 - E. Imperfections in our methods of enforcement are constantly being eliminated as we have more experience.
 - 1. President Hoover's Crime Commission recommended speedier trials, heavier sentences, increased appropriations, more formidable border control and the transfer of the prohibition department from the Treasury to the Department of Justice where it logically belongs.
 - 2. The placing of prohibition agents under Civil Service requirements is a recent improvement.
- II. Total prohibition is necessary because of the growth of our increasingly complicated civilization.
 - A. Our industrial development demands it.
 - 1. Henry Ford says that the present scale of manufacture of motor cars would have been utterly impossible except for prohibition.
 - 2. The use of alcohol cannot be permitted to those who manufacture automobiles, airplanes and other complicated and dangerous machines, upon whose efficiency in construction many lives depend.

- B. The welfare of society demands the same dependability on the part of these who operate these machines.
 - 1. The growth in the number and use of automobiles was one inducement for national prohibition.
 - 2. Automobiles have increased in number 200 per cent since the amendment was adopted.
 - C. Our social life itself is another argument for prohibition.
 - 1. Increasing congestion of population, especially in cities, makes a drunken individual potentially dangerous to large numbers of his fellow men.
 - 2. Dr. Edward A. Ross of the University of Wisconsin says
 - a. "Out of a bitter experience with an unmitigated social evil grew the sentiment for destroying it 'root and branch'."
- III. The Ontario system should not be adopted, because it leads away from temperance and sobriety.
- A. The amount of liquor manufactured and consumed in Ontario is constantly increasing.
 - 1. Eighteen government liquor stores in June, 1927, had increased to 117 in a year and a half.
 - 2. Sales for the five months ending October 31, 1928 showed an increase of 35 per cent over those of the corresponding months of the previous year.
 - 3. The drinking bill for Ontario averages almost a million dollars a week.
 - a. The population numbers about three million people.
 - B. The government is involved in the business.
 - 1. That which the government tolerates or approves of tends to become the accepted standard of the people governed.
 - 2. Governments are conservative and tend only toward such acts as will perpetuate their existence.
 - a. Enormous profits are made by the government.
 - (1) In 1928, these profits amounted to \$8,000,000.

- b. These profits will increase as more liquor is consumed.
 - C. The government has created an industry which is fast becoming a leading one.
 1. The capital invested in the liquor industry in Ontario today is 44 per cent more than that invested ten years ago.
 2. It must arrange to perpetuate itself.
 - a. By large contributions to campaign funds.
 - b. By controlling votes and the offices filled.
- IV. The Ontario system of liquor control is a failure.
 - A. It has failed in Canada.
 1. The illicit manufacturing of liquor still continues.
 - a. Respect for and enforcement of law have not increased.
 2. The prime motive of the system has become, not government control, but government sale of liquor.
 - a. There is an annual increase in drinking of 34.5 per cent.
 - b. During the first five months of liquor control convictions for violation of the law increased at the rate of 100 a month.
 - B. A similar system was tried and found a failure in the United States.
 1. This system was the South Carolina Liquor Dispensary.
 - a. Its purpose and principles were the same as that of the Ontario system.
 2. During the first ten years of its life, the drinking bill of South Carolina increased 41 per cent.
 - a. At the same time, crime increased by 350 per cent while the increase in population was less than 17 per cent.
 3. After a trial of twenty-four years it was voted out by a majority of more than two to one.
 - a. Yet the plan was tried out under the most favorable conditions and with the most powerful support.

- V. The alternative to the Ontario system is to keep our prohibition law and improve it.
 - A. The plans already suggested for improvement should be adopted.
 - B. The American public should be thoroly educated as to the evils of liquor.
 - C. Our Federal and state governments and individuals also should support and help enforce the law.

ONTARIO SYSTEM OF LIQUOR CONTROL

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

versus

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CHAIRMAN

Mr. Aubrey Williams

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We are to have this evening a discussion on a very important question, a question concerning which I suppose there is as much difference of opinion as any in America today. This discussion is to take place in the form of a debate. There are two universities represented; the University of Wisconsin and Ohio State University.

The subject of the debate is, RESOLVED: That the several states should be allowed to adopt the Ontario system of liquor control. Wisconsin is to support the Affirmative and Ohio State the Negative. It is my pleasure to introduce as the first speaker on the Affirmative Mr. David Rabinovitz, representing the University of Wisconsin.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

David Rabinovitz, Wisconsin

As far as we have been able to discover, this is the first time that a team from Ohio State University has debated on our home platform. For this reason we feel it is a double honor on our part to welcome the gentlemen from Ohio State University.

If a person from Mars were to come to this country and stay here long enough to observe conditions, he would think that the name of this country was prohibition, that all we ever talked about was prohibition, and he certainly would be astounded

to learn that the subject of discussion was the failure of a federal law. Now, we are not here to-night in the interests of the Milwaukee Beer Verein or the Langdon Street Temperance Union, but our main purpose to-night is to offer a solution to the present situation, a situation that has become a sore spot upon American welfare and American security. We feel that ten years of national prohibition have shown that something must be done, and we are proposing what we believe is the only sane and logical solution of the problem. Under our plan the people in the individual states will make their own selections, for if they are inherently dry and desire dry legislation they may have it, but we are concerned with those definite wet areas where the sentiment of the people is not behind prohibition. We are concerned with the states like New York, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, and it is for these states that we favor the adoption of the Ontario system of liquor control.

However, we are not in favor of the return of the old time saloon, but the question to-night is, what are we going to do about the present situation? We condemn national prohibition for two reasons. First of all, national prohibition is inherently wrong; secondly, national prohibition has been proven an absolute failure, and it is for these two reasons that we favor the adoption of the Ontario system of liquor control.

National prohibition is inherently wrong because it took a matter which was for state legislation and made it a matter for national legislation. For, prior to the eighteenth amendment we find that thirty-three of our states were enforcing their own state dry laws successfully because the sentiment of the people was behind those laws. Mr. Archibald Stevenson, noted attorney and student of the problem of prohibition, in his book called *States Rights and Prohibition* says this: "In most of the dry states the efforts of state officers to enforce the law were sincere and reasonably effective because they had the wholehearted support of public opinion." The sentiment of the people was behind those laws.

Then we have the testimony of Mr. David Colvin, noted authority on prohibition and editor of the book called *Prohibition in the United States*. He points out there that state legislation was highly successful, especially after the passage of the Webb-Kenyon act in 1913, under which act the shipment of liquor into dry states was forbidden. In reference to this act Mr. Colvin

has this to say: "The passage of the act gave an impetus to the movement for state prohibition inasmuch as thereafter a state could enforce prohibition more effectively."

Let us take a look at a particular state before national prohibition. As early as 1908 we find Mr. J. Cuddy, president of the Kansas Temperance Union making the following statement: "All over Kansas the enforcement of the law has decreased crime and almost rendered unnecessary police protection," and he further continues, "During the entire time that prohibitory law has been in existence, seventy counties have remained dry."

My friends, that was prohibition under state control. Now, why was it so successful then, and why is it so fruitless to-day? Simply because the people at that time well understood and realized that in a large country such as ours, containing so many different classes of people, interests are always varied, for the people in New York, under different conditions, would not want a law which is more desirable for the people in the rural states of Kansas or Texas, but the proponents of national prohibition forgot this and attempted to place wet states under a wholesale program of prohibition, and it is true that to-day we find the greatest amount of resentment coming from these wet states.

Now we believe that New York and Wisconsin, who have repealed their state dry laws, and who to-day are voicing resentment against the eighteenth amendment in the Literary Digest poll, have as much right to be wet as Kansas or Texas have to be dry, and each state may do as it pleases on the question of prohibition. Just as a doctor prescribes medicine to suit a particular case, so must the Federal Government recognize that certain states are inherently wet and will never obey a law just because it is desirable to the people in the dry states, and uniformity in such a law as prohibition is neither desirable nor is it possible.

Another reason why national prohibition is inherently wrong is that it disregards the fact that a law of this nature must have the sanction from the customs and habits of a people. Why will the people in the dry states obey and why will the people in the wet states not obey this particular law? Because they believe that the Federal Government cannot tell them what they shall drink, for one could talk until he were blue in the face and he couldn't make Mr. Schmidt of Wisconsin quit drinking beer just because Sir Walter Raleigh of Virginia detests beer. Mr.

Schmidt will obey other criminal laws because they are wrong in themselves, but prohibition became a wrong merely by being printed on our statute books. There is a general agreement as to the other criminal laws but not as to prohibition. If we were to ask anyone of you to-night whether or not murder was wrong, we believe not one of you would say murder was right, but one violating the prohibition law does not believe he is doing wrong for there is a general feeling in favor of those laws. For that reason we never hear of anti-murder or anti-larceny leagues, but we very often hear of anti-prohibition leagues.

It is a cardinal principle of legislation of this kind that the minority can not force such a law upon a majority, for our progress of law legislation shows that such laws can not be enforced. It is certainly true that even in the days of the kings, a king aimed to abide by the rules and customs of his people, and certainly in a democracy such as ours, no minority can assume the role of dictator and say to these people in the large states of New York and Illinois, no matter how you may not desire the law, no matter what you think of it, year after year, generation after generation, you must submit to its dictates because we of Kansas or Texas want such a law. My friends, one-half of this nation can not tell the other half what it shall drink, for how can the majesty and sanctity of the eighteenth amendment mean anything to these people when it does not express their beliefs?

The eighteenth amendment must come out of the Constitution and the right to regulate liquor traffic must be restored to the people in the individual states. If the Negative does ask for stricter enforcement, we believe that a free people have a certain amount of patience, and when that patience is exhausted, any government that will still continue to enforce that law is creating a condition that will lead to nothing but disrespect for the law and internal strife. We ask that the Federal Government restore to the several states that which was wrongfully taken from them in 1920, and allow them to make laws in conformity with their own habits and customs. We have taken you through the period when prohibition was handled successfully under state control; we have shown you how national prohibition is inherently wrong, first, because it took a matter which was for state legislation and made it a matter of national legislation, and secondly, it disregarded the fact that a law of this

nature must have sanction from the customs and habits of the people. We will continue and show you how national prohibition has proven a failure, and will also show you how the Ontario system of liquor control will relieve us of our present difficulties.

FIRST NEGATIVE

L. J. Sorensen, Ohio State

MR. CHAIRMAN AND OPPONENTS, FRIENDS OF WISCONSIN: We are grateful for the welcome which we have received at Wisconsin. We are honored to be, as the introductory speaker pointed out, the first Ohio team to appear on a platform before you. We wish to congratulate our opponents on their consistency to an old adage, their loyalty to that adage that "Consistency, thou art a virtue." To-night as speakers they mount the platform to support an age-old tradition which helped build up the state of Wisconsin, or at least your largest city. You all remember the beer that made Milwaukee famous. And to-night these speakers are paying loyalty to that wornout tradition which in days gone by built up Milwaukee.

But even though they are loyal to this adage of consistency, they have a few inconsistencies in their argument to-night. First of all they tell us that their objection to our present prohibition law is the fact that it is national. They seem not to object to the principle of the prohibition law, which is the principle of total prohibition, and in replacing a national system because they object to it in being national, they wish to adopt a system, the main difference of which from ours is that it isn't total prohibition but merely a compromise with total prohibition. I point out to you that one-third of their time is already gone and they have not as yet told us one thing about the Ontario system, and it is the Ontario system that we are debating this evening. Now, we want to know something about that Ontario system. The audience has a right to know about it. Let's hear the law itself and see if we really want it. Another question we would like to ask our opponents is this: who, under the Ontario system, who is going to be the marvelous person that can operate a government dispensary and tell at a glance when anyone comes in whether he can hold a pint, a quart, or a gallon, without showing

signs of over-indulgence. They tell us that ten years is not long enough to try any amendment. They seek to belittle an amendment. As I will show you later, it took us centuries to get this amendment. And if they had read the paper this evening, they would have found that one of the country's leading statesman, before Congress to-day, tells us, and, mind you, he is a former prohibition opponent himself, that we must have at least a century before we will know whether our present prohibition laws are satisfactory or not. Contrast that with our opponents' opinion that ten years is enough. They bring up an old question which fundamentally is irrelevant to this discussion to-night. We are debating the Ontario system of liquor control and they are debating, evidently, from the first speech, the question of states rights, which we thought had been decided at least sixty years ago in the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the Civil War and the amendments that followed the Civil War.

Prohibition is a failure, our opponents tell us, and yet Professor Irving Fisher, prominent economist of this country, and head of that department of the University of Yale, writes: "We may say that prohibition is not only sound hygiene but sound economics; not only is it the greatest hygienic experiment but the greatest economic experiment in history and one of the most successful." And further, according to the report of the subcommittee of the committee on alcoholism, acting as a committee of Congress, we find that prohibition in ten years has enabled charitable institutions to take \$74,000,000 from funds formerly used to support cases of drink-caused poverty alone, and use it in other forms of really constructive welfare. Does this look like prohibition is a failure? And yet after ten years, Ladies and Gentlemen, they would have us discard it, and return—to what? To a system of which they have as yet told us nothing, which has been in existence only two years, and which, as we will show you later, has been a total failure.

They tell us prohibition can not be enforced, and yet according to Judge Andrew A. Brude, of the Northwestern Law School and president of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, "There can be no question that if the state and federal authorities made up their minds to enforce the laws against intoxicating liquors they could do so."

According to Chief Justice Charles Evan Hughes: "Everyone is ready to sustain the law he likes. That is not in the

proper sense respect for law and order. The real test of respect for law is where the law is upheld even though it hurts."

Now, the principle of our present prohibition law is no modern invention. As I told you a few moments ago, it was first introduced into this country nearly three centuries ago when the colony of Connecticut prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquor to the Indians. Other colonies followed and by 1700 all states had similar laws. Early in the nineteenth century the American people became interested in total prohibition. In 1833 Georgia adopted local option laws and other states followed her example, and finally in 1917, as our opponents have pointed out for us, thirty-three states had total prohibition. And then the American people as a whole saw the need for total national prohibition and through their representatives the eighteenth amendment was adopted and submitted for ratification, and here, as final proof that the American people, contrary to our opponents, do want the eighteenth amendment, let me point out to you that forty-six out of the forty-eight states ratified that amendment, giving it the largest majority ever given any amendment to our Constitution, and yet, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is this law which we as a people have struggled with for nearly three centuries which our opponents would have you believe is not wanted by that American people who so unanimously and so overwhelmingly welcomed it.

When the amendment was finally adopted legislation was enacted providing for its enforcement, and being conceived by human beings, this legislation was not final or faultless, and embarrassments resulting from these imperfections are being attributed daily to the principle of our prohibition laws themselves, the principle of total prohibition, but these faults are being constantly remedied. President Hoover's Crime Commission in its recent report recommended speedier trials, heavier sentences, increased appropriations, more formidable border control, and the transfer of the prohibition department from the Treasury to the Justice department where it logically belongs, and in the last session of Congress the Jones Act was passed providing for heavier sentences and fines. The placing of prohibition agents under Civil Service requirements is a recent adoption. So we see many increased methods of enforcement which are as yet inadequately tried. In view of these facts, that our system was only adopted after need became apparent for it after three cen-

turies of thought and struggle, and that methods of enforcement are as yet far from exhausted, we of the Negative claim that the change, the backward step suggested by the Affirmative, is unnecessary. We further contend that the principle, or rather that the trend of our civilization makes total prohibition as a principle even more essential, and even more essential to-day than it was ten years ago. In the first place, our industrial development demands total prohibition. Hundreds and thousands of hands are at work on one single product and that product, when finished, is going to be just as strong and just as safe as the least fitted worker has done his part. Henry Ford tells us that the present scheme and scale in the manufacture of motor cars, for example, would have been utterly impossible except for the eighteenth amendment, and his automobiles, let me point out, to the Affirmative, are not confined to the state where he manufactures them: they go all over the nation.

And further, we can not permit the use of alcohol to the slightest degree on the part of those who manufacture automobiles, aeroplanes and other complicated and dangerous machines, upon whose efficiency of construction many lives depend. And secondly, the welfare of society demands this same sober dependability upon the part of those who operate these machines as on the part of those who manufacture them. The growth in the number and use of the automobile was one of the prime factors which convinced the American people of the need of total national prohibition. At that time there were but seven million automobiles, while to-day there are twenty-four million, an increase of sixteen million, or better than 200 per cent since the eighteenth amendment was adopted just ten years ago. We can not permit the use of alcohol upon the part of those who operate those twenty-four million automobiles. I need not compute the congestion this would bring to our highways or cities, nor the number of lives that depend upon the sober dependability of those millions of drivers. And finally our social life itself demands total national prohibition. We no longer live on farms a mile or so from each other, nor the majority of us on a city lot with ten feet between us and our neighbors. Rather we, as a whole, are cuddled together, dozens, hundreds of families in one city building, and whereas the use of liquor harmed only the individual himself in former times, it now endangers thousands of his fellow men. So we see these countless trends of our civ-

ilization demand total temperance which can be obtained, as experience shows, only by total prohibition.

Dr. Edward A. Ross, of your department of sociology says: "A long and variegated experience with attempts to regulate the liquor traffic,"—the Ontario system, if you please—"A long and variegated experience," he says, "with attempts to regulate the liquor traffic showed that it was incapable of being made decent and law abiding. It would respect no law, heed no warnings or protests. So, not out of sour resentment of our people's pleasures, but out of a bitter experience with an unmitigated social evil, grew the sentiment for destroying it, 'root and branch.'"

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. T. C. Kammholz, Wisconsin

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My worthy opponent just told us we must have prohibition at least one hundred years before we can tell whether or not it is going to be a success or failure. That statement reminds us of the attitude of a certain war-time patriot who ten years ago said "We are going to fight this out to the bitter end if it takes every cent of money that everybody else has got."

Now, I wish to compliment my opponent on his excellent statement of the advantages of prohibition, and what prohibition can do for us. His speech reminds me very much of the speeches I heard ten years ago in the back woods of Wisconsin from the advocates of the Anti-Saloon League and the W. C. T. U. who came up there and advocated prohibition, but I want to remind you we are debating prohibition to-day, in 1930, after ten years of attempted enforcement.

Our first speaker has pointed out to you that prior to the eighteenth amendment the people in our dry states had their own legislation, while those in the wet were working toward temperance by a system of educational and moral suasion. He showed you further that with the enactment of national legislation, and this coercion, of avowedly wet states by the dry, we might well have expected a colossal failure. Let us now look at present conditions and see if they do not bear out all the dire predictions that were made. My friends, under national prohibition the

entire United States has become a house divided against itself. Regardless of what the sentiment of the several states may have been in 1918, we find that to-day Montana, Nevada, New York, and Wisconsin have expressed open resentment against the eighteenth amendment by repealing their state dry laws. Connecticut and Rhode Island originally declined to ratify the eighteenth amendment; Maryland refused to pass a state act; North Dakota, a bone dry state for forty years, came within 2 per cent of repeal of its state law in 1928; Delaware by a poll taken in the same year voted eight to one for change in the amendment; Massachusetts, which had adopted a state law in 1924, four years later voted against federal enforcement by an overwhelming majority. So you can see that the people in these great states resent the coercion of other states and will not attempt to enforce a law that's out of tune with the public will.

But let us consider further the effect of national prohibition upon the formerly dry states. Kansas, as my colleagues told you, has long been considered a leader in dry legislation, and a state that had achieved remarkable success with state prohibition. Compare that condition with the situation presented by William Shepherd, who investigated conditions for *Collier's*, and says this is an article written last January: "Kansas under Federal Prohibition is as wet as any other state in the Union. This means that it is wetter than it was in the days when Kansas people depended upon their own law enforcement. The present wetness of Kansas is not a Kansas wetness after all—you feel that Kansas is buried under a portion of the great national wet blanket, and that people who wish to have their state made dry departed with their loss of local control."

That, we believe, well sums up our present situation, we are a house divided against itself, with the wet states opposing the control of a centralized government, and with their resentment passing into and undoing the gains that the dry states once had made. If you would have further evidence of the rising tide of disapproval against our force of Federal enforcement, consider the leaders of social, economic and political thought who have allied themselves with the Association against the Prohibition Amendment;—consider the nation-wide women's organizations that have been formed, the voluntary committees of lawyers that have been organized in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore and other large cities, and finally consider the returns in the Literary

Digest's nation-wide prohibition poll. In the early results from twenty representative states we find that 412,000 voters have cast their ballot for modification or repeal, while but 191,000 voted for continued enforcement. My friends, if we face all this evidence in an impartial and judicious light, doesn't it seem that national prohibition does not have the sanction of our people?

Let us consider more closely the concrete results of prohibition,—conditions to-day that have come about because millions decline to respect a law that is alien to their conscience and to human nature. According to police department figures from 518 cities throughout the country, we find that arrests for drunkenness have increased under prohibition from 279,000 in 1920 to 668,000 in 1929. That, you will note, was an increase of almost 300 per cent. Compare that with the situation in Canada, where, after national prohibition had proved a failure, state control of the liquor problem was adopted, and where, in the last eight years, there has been a 50 per cent decrease in arrests for intoxication. Is it not significant, further, that the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in a bulletin issued last January, reports that among its nineteen million industrial policy holders, the 1929 death rate from alcoholism was almost six times as high as the rate for 1920. Contrast that with this terse statement concerning Canada: "The mortality from poison alcohol has been almost nil; in 1929 there were only eleven alcoholic deaths among one and one-quarter million insured Canadians."

A decade ago you will remember the battle cry of the Prohibitionists was "Adopt Federal enforcement and drunkenness will practically disappear, crime will be reduced by one-half." Far different to-day is the story of our over-crowded prisons everywhere and convict riots that have broken out. We have had the report of the Illinois Crime Commission which, after its recent investigation on cause of crime in Chicago says this: "Prohibition has introduced the most difficult problem of law enforcement in the field of organized crime." The Chief of Police of New Orleans recently stated that 50 per cent of the city's crime was directly attributed to the prohibition laws. Official government figures tell us that our 1929 federal and state prison population was 96,125 as compared with 68,000 in 1915. Doesn't all this evidence seem to indicate that under prohibition there has been an increase rather than a decrease in crime? It is in the face of these deplorable conditions that we

are seeking a solution to our present problem. The Negative may well enough criticize the plan we are proposing, but what remedies do they offer for conditions to-day? Our present law has been responsible, further, for an orgy of graft and corruption such as our country has never before experienced. The possibility of enormous profits has been responsible for the growth of huge underworld rings that have forced their way into politics by bribery and coercion. Edward Dean Sullivan, newspaper writer and investigator has this to say concerning gang activities directly attributable to the prohibition laws: "Al Capone is the head of one gang of the more than eight hundred powerful gangs now at work in this country under prohibition. In 1927 the gross income of his one gang, by his own admission, was seventy million dollars. To those who are unfamiliar with the terrific import and progress of crime under prohibition it might be well to add two more provable figures to indicate the caliber of this crime." He then shows how in 1927 E. C. Yellowley, federal prohibition administrator for Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, was offered one quarter of a million dollars if he would keep his eyes and hands off one alcohol plant in the city of Chicago. In the same year Morgan A. Collins, chief of the police force of Chicago was offered \$1200 a day if he would not interfere with the transportation of beer by one gang. And if our opponents would tell you that the development of conditions in Chicago has not been typical, listen to this testimony of Edwin A. Olson, United States district attorney in Chicago. He says: "Chicago is before the public eye principally because the national menace of Prohibition has made more rapid progress there than elsewhere. Within two years, as matters are progressing, not less than twelve great cities of America will be comparable with Chicago in the politics-prohibition-crime alliance." New York is not far behind Chicago even to-day for in the wards of Commissioner Whalen of that city New York's thirty-two thousand speakeasies are hot beds of crime and immortality. In Philadelphia just recently over one hundred members of the police force were indicted for conspiracy to violate the prohibition law. Many of them, ordinary policemen, had bank accounts that ran as high as \$190,000 and they all refused to tell where the money had come from. We again ask the Negative what they propose to do about conditions to-day? The Federal Government last year spent over fifty million dollars in attempted enforce-

ment, it seized over thirty-two million gallons of illicit liquor, but all these efforts failed to even perturb the bootleg industry. More and more every day profits from the underworld liquor traffic are subsidizing all forms of crime and corruption.

My friends, when national prohibition was launched a decade ago, it was an enterprise doomed to failure. For ten years now we have had that failure ever before us, and we believe that the time has come for a change. We offer our system of state control, not as a panacea for all evils, but a practical solution that will strike at the root of our present problem by taking the profit out of the underworld liquor traffic. The profit that is to-day subsidizing all forms of crime and corruption, and tearing its way into the very vitals of our machinery of government. We have tried to nationalize prohibition, and have failed. All that is left for us is to democratize the whole subject and give back to the states, laws that will be enforceable in them.

SECOND NEGATIVE

J. R. Allen, Ohio State

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I would like to emphasize our opponent's first statement that we are debating prohibition to-day. First I would like to ask them one question; are you opposed to the principle of total prohibition? We have asked them one other question before in making clear to you the prohibition law as it works in Ontario to-day. We asked them to state that law to you. So far they have not done so. So far they have never shown you any objection to the present system of prohibition and yet they would have you adopt the Ontario system. They have said a house divided against itself can not stand but states choice would certainly make us a house divided against itself. They told you we were debating the prohibition question, but so far all they have been talking about is states rights. The Affirmative say prohibition is not the will of the people, and cite as authority the 291,000 votes cast in the *Literary Digest* survey a few weeks ago. According to the editor's own statement he goes on to say, "No conclusions can be reached from these figures. The people are hereby warned it is too soon to derive any conclusions from this report." He further adds that many fluctuations may be expected to occur from time to time be-

fore this vote is completed. And we further call your attention to the fact that supporters of the dry law were strongly urged not to participate in this vote. William Howard Taft writes about the prohibition violation situation or individual rights in the spirit of democratic government. He says, "No one who in the matter of national prohibition sells his personal opinion or claims a personal liberty to higher sanction than the overwhelming constitutional expression of the people is an example of practical bolshevism."

We would like to point out to you a few of the convictions for keeping private stills in Ontario. In 1927 there were 942 while in 1928 there were 1328. According to the Charts of *New Outlook* of Toronto, deaths from alcoholism in Canada have also increased. In 1921 they were twelve per thousand, whereas in 1927 there were twenty-two.

The first speaker of the Negative, Ladies and Gentlemen, told you that prohibition was a long, slow, gradual development over the past two centuries. He further showed you that total prohibition was absolutely necessary because of our complicated civilization and because of our numerous dangerous machines. We take it as an evident truth that that system should be adopted or retained that best leads to temperance and sobriety. The Negative advocates the Ontario system should not be adopted because it leads away from temperance and sobriety. Under the Ontario system it can be seen readily that the amount of liquor manufactured and consumed is steadily increasing. Ontario had eighteen government liquor stores in June, 1927, which were then sufficient to dispense the liquor. Less than a year and one-half later Ontario boasted of one hundred seventeen liquor stores engaged in the business of selling liquor to the people of Ontario. The *Canadian Annual Review*, in its report for activities ended October 31, 1928, reports, "Sales for the last five months showed an increase of 6,500,000 or 35 per cent increase over the corresponding months of the previous year." The report further adds that the government of Ontario derived a net profit of eight million dollars and opened up thirty-nine new liquor stores and twenty-seven new warehouses. Add to this the \$732,000 worth of wines sold by the fifty-one wineries, and the money taken in by different places licensed to sell 4.4 per cent beer, and the drinking bill for Ontario averages almost one million dollars a week. Think of it, a million dollars a week

spent on liquor alone, and it must be kept in mind also that the population of Ontario isn't half that of Ohio; about three million people. This shows clearly that the people of Ontario are steadily consuming more and more liquor, a commodity known to all to be habit forming. We look for a constant increase in the amount of liquor consumed in Ontario and this leads away from the principle of temperance. A second reason why the Ontario system leads away from temperance is because the government is involved in the business. That which the government tends to approve of or tolerates becomes the accepted standard of the people governed. How can children supposedly growing up to be temperate, to avoid the use of liquor and to consider it harmful really be temperate, when that commodity is sold by the government that controls them? Furthermore, governments are conservative and tend to do only such acts as will perpetuate their existence. To expect the government of Ontario to deny its inhabitants liquor, after it has sold liquor for some length of time, is to expect the impossible. Enormous profits are made by the government in this business. It becomes a source of easy revenue. In the first five months of operation of the Ontario system the government derived four million dollars from this source. In 1928 the government of Ontario received eight million dollars in profits from this liquor system. The continued and gradual increase in the amount of liquor consumed means increased profits for the government, and as this profit increases and as the amount of liquor consumed increases, the goal of temperance and sobriety automatically removes itself farther and farther from reality.

A third reason why the Ontario system leads away from temperance and sobriety is because the government has installed an industry which is constantly growing, which is now almost first in importance, and which by its large contributions to the government guarantees maintenance of the industry and its control over governmental policies. The liquor industry is constantly growing. Capital invested in 1927 was sixty-two million dollars. This was an increase of twenty-seven and one-half million dollars over that invested ten years ago. In other words, the capital invested in the liquor industry in Ontario to-day is 44 per cent more than invested ten years ago. The liquor industry is almost first in importance. This is proved by the statement of the Canadian Pacific Railroad: "The brewing of

beer has made the most rapid and consistent progress of all Canadian industries. In a few years liquor will become of first importance."

We can readily see that when the liquor industry becomes the leading industry of Ontario, the principle of temperance and sobriety becomes more and more remote. And such would be the situation in the United States if we adopted the Ontario system. The liquor industry in Ontario being now almost first in importance and, having many millions of dollars invested in it, must arrange to perpetuate itself. To do this the liquor interests have obtained control of the government. They do this by large contributions to campaign funds, thus controlling the votes of the candidates and of the offices filled. There are many illustrations of liberal campaign funds having been contributed by liquor interests. The Gooderham-Worts Distilleries contributed \$25,000 for the purpose of securing the Ontario system. The Hiram Walker and Sons liquor interests contributed \$183,000 for the same purpose.

The leading industries in the United States to-day are the automobile, the manufacturing, and the railroad industries. Shall we displace these leading industries and permit liquor manufacturing to become the leading industry by adopting the Ontario system? We believe that that system should be adopted or retained which best leads to temperance and sobriety. The Negative advocate that the Ontario system should not be adopted because it leads away from the principle of temperance and sobriety inasmuch as it creates a liquor industry destined to become the leading industry, which, due to its large investment must make provision for perpetuating itself, and which perpetuates itself by large contributions to campaign funds and so secures control of the government.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

J. Gunnar Back, Wisconsin

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Thus far in this debate we have shown that before the national prohibition law several states had gone a long way toward the gradual creation of a national dry sentiment. Ten years of prohibition have passed and we have found that not only has it been impossible to convince

the majority of citizens in wet states like New York, New Jersey, and Wisconsin, that drinking should be considered a crime, but the open violation of the law upon the part of citizens in these states has extended into states which were formerly dry, with the result that we have in the United States to-day a growing, organized illegal liquor traffic that is supplying the country from coast to coast. We feel that you will agree with us, no matter where you live, that the person who wants to drink to-day can get liquor, and is drinking that liquor whether it is good or bad for him. We would ask the first speaker of the opposition who said that we must have prohibition in order to keep drinking out of automobiles, to go out to the road houses around Madison, to any road house, and try to convince those people out there that they should not be drinking in automobiles, when they are able to get joy-producing liquor almost anywhere if they know the phone number, or the right door.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we feel that the time has come to face the facts as they really are. It is well enough to say the government should not engage in the business of selling liquor, that it is poisonous, but when we realize that the illegal traffic is actually growing, that bootlegging has become so organized that Al Capone could pay out thirty millions in bribes in the city of Chicago in one year and still walk the streets a free man, when we realize that crime and corruption caused by prohibition are beating on our very doors, we realize that we are facing a mighty serious problem. The members of the opposition have argued that prohibition as a principle is one hundred years old, and that we must have it at least a century more to see whether it can be enforced. But what remedies have they offered to do away with the thousands of speakeasies and bootleggers selling liquor in the United States today, bootleggers who are not waiting for one hundred years to see whether the law can be enforced. For ten years the United States has been theoretically dry. In spite of the fact that we have actually killed innocent citizens in efforts to enforce the law, in spite of the fact that we have made severe laws, there has been no promise that prohibition can be enforced. Does it not seem to you, then, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the only sane and the only wise thing to do is to take this illegal liquor traffic out of the hands of organized criminals and to place that traffic into the hands of the government where some reasonable control over it can be assured?

If the government does not try to control this illegal traffic by some new means, we ask you, who is going to do it? Finally, Ladies and Gentlemen, in answer to our national predicament it is my privilege at last to talk about the Ontario system.

We are offering, I would remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen, at the very outset, a plan which has been tried and which is working in Ontario to-day after ten years of prohibition failed in that province. Let us see how the Ontario system will accomplish what we are seeking for it.

In Ontario all hard liquors are sold by the government through government owned and operated liquor stores. With government competition the large-scale bootlegger has disappeared in Ontario, in spite of the argument of the opposition that there were some one thousand small stills discovered during the last year. How does that compare with ten thousand speakeasies in Chicago, a figure secured by the testimony of M. A. Collins, former Chief of Police of that city, and thirty-two thousand speakeasies in the city of New York alone, according to the testimony of Police Commissioner Whalen? One thousand in a whole province as compared with thirty-two thousand in one United States city alone.

In Ontario each customer buys a permit issued by the government, a permit which is an open record of the customer's purchases. As soon as that customer's permit shows excessive purchase, he is refused sale and his permit cancelled. That is how the Ontario system controls. Do we have any control of this sort to-day, Ladies and Gentlemen, over American speakeasies where the owner is always drumming up his business?

Under the Ontario system the dispensary is as clean and as orderly as a bank. There is no loitering or drinking about the premises. No drinking of hard liquor is tolerated in public places in the province of Ontario.

There are no signs advertising liquor stores, no billboards holding out temptations to try various brands. In the city of Madison not so long ago a campus bootlegger openly advertised in one of the campus publications, and I am sure his phone number or that of some other campus liquor supplier can be found on cards in the halls of every fraternity house on the campus.

In Ontario government stores are opened and closed at set hours and are closed on holidays and election days. Government

inspectors supervise the shipment of all liquors from distilleries to the stores. The books of the brewers and distillers are at all times open to government inspection. I ask you: What chance does the American government have to look into the seventy million dollar business done by Al Capone alone in Chicago each year? The Ontario system, Ladies and Gentlemen, will knock the profits out of bootlegging and put such obnoxious citizens as Mr. Capone out of business.

I have already mentioned the fact that Police Commissioner Whalen has said that there are thirty-two thousand speakeasies in New York alone. We ask the members of the opposition to give us one single testimonial from one single police officer in Ontario saying that there are even one-third that many in the whole province.

In Ontario if a complaint is brought to a member of the board that someone in that family is causing unhappiness by drinking, that person may be made to stand trial, and if found guilty his permit is revoked. From that time on he is placed under the direct supervision of the police. Drinking is punished by severe sentences and cancellation of permit. That again is how the Ontario system controls, as the plan works in Ontario.

Let me remind you at the very outset, in advocating the Ontario system we are not advocating an idle theory. Ontario had prohibition for ten years. Every province in Canada has had prohibition, and with the exception of the small province of Prince Edward Island, every single province has turned to government control. Ontario is by far the most conservative of all provinces. In 1926 by majority vote of 240,000 people the government control plan was adopted in that province, and so satisfied have the people been that in the election of October 30, 1929, Premier Ferguson was returned to office by a two to one vote over his prohibition rival. It was the same Premier Ferguson who installed the control plan in Ontario.

We feel, Ladies and Gentlemen, that it is important that you should know that the people of Ontario themselves have placed their stamp of approval upon the government control system. Let us turn to testimony. The vote of the people says the plan has worked. Several years ago at the request of the Hearst \$25,000 Temperance Prize Plan Committee, two impartial investigators were sent into Canada. These two men were Dr. H. H. Sheldon, head of the Department of Physics, New York

University, and Archdeacon Joseph Dodson of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We have a summary of this Committee's report contained in the book *Temperance or Prohibition* published in 1929.

"A survey was made on the basis of actual government figures. Canada found that under prohibition lawlessness and drunkenness increased steadily, convictions for drunkenness increased regularly, and the consumption of hard liquors showed alarming gains. . . Since government control has been in force there has been a decrease of 50 per cent of arrests for all causes and a survey of figures over a period of seven years shows that there has been a decrease of 50 per cent of arrests for all causes and a 60 per cent decrease in arrests for drunkenness."

We turn to the Ontario Liquor Board report for the year ending October 30, 1928. "The results of statistics show a reduction in the consumption of distilled liquor in Ontario as between 1915 and 1928, including imported liquors of 2,589,000 gallons." A reduction, you will note, Ladies and Gentlemen, of 37 per cent in the actual consumption of liquor. That is how we answer the argument of the opposition that the government control plan has increased the consumption of hard liquor.

Judge Emerson Coatsworth, Toronto City Court, says: "I have known Toronto under the old saloon days, under prohibition, and under government control, and I stand four-square behind the last system as the best. There are convictions in my court where there were formerly acquittals."

Dr. C. J. Decker, superintendent of the Toronto Public Receiving Hospital has this to say: "The number of motor accidents due to liquor and of cases of alcoholism has been greatly reduced under liquor control." Contrast this testimony with that of Dr. Thomas Gruber, Superintendent of the Detroit Receiving Hospital: "The habit of drinking diluted alcohol now prevails in the best circles. We get degenerates who are drinking varnish."

Let me remind you that we do not ask that the states dry in sentiment adopt the Ontario system. We confidently expect those states will remain dry, but we are convinced that only by the adoption of the Ontario system will those states which are wet in sentiment ever get back respect for law and order, those states which never have obeyed and are not now obeying the law simply because sentiment is against it. In these states the forces

of money and officers now being dissipated in the hopeless task of checking bootlegging activities will be spent in concentrating on permit violations.

In closing the case for the Affirmative, let me remind you again that before 1920, thirty-three states were reasonably dry. The national prohibition law did not dry up the remaining states. Wet states refused to obey the law, and states once dry are now becoming wetter. There is a widespread feeling of resentment against that law. In the forty-eight states who ratified the amendment in 1930, at the present time according to a *Literary Digest* poll the vote is three to one for changing the eighteenth amendment in the United States Constitution. Bootleggers are organizing and profitably operating in the United States. Ontario had the same problem and solved it by a plan which we feel is an intelligent plan for liquor control.

THIRD NEGATIVE

C. H. Schug, Ohio State

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We wish to remind you at this time that all of our opponents' time has been spent and yet, they have failed to read the Ontario law to us. We want you to tell the audience just what this Ontario system is all about. The men have totally disregarded our questions this evening. We asked these men to kindly tell us if they are opposed to the principle of total prohibition. Furthermore, we have asked our opponents another question which they have failed to answer, thus far this evening. Under the Ontario system, who is qualified to decide as to the amount of liquor that an individual can consume, within a certain amount of time, without over-indulgence? This is humanly impossible. We would like to ask these men, how this can be made to be humanly possible, and how such a system can be made to work successfully? They ask us to cite one authority who says there were increases in the number of violations under the Ontario system. They just want us to cite one, so we will cite J. N. McClean, chief government inspector of liquors: "The illicit manufacturing of liquor continues." The Affirmative have said that the Ontario system produced desirable results. However, according to George E. Foster, greatest liv-

ing Canadian statesman to-day, "Respect for and enforcement of law have not been increased. From every 'government sale' province comes evidence of increasing home brew, illicit beer sales, illicit stills, the multiplication of blind pigs and abounding bootleggers great and small."

The gentlemen of the Affirmative have told you that the Ontario system regulates. We would like to ask just what the Ontario system does regulate? Certainly not the sale of liquor, for according to the report ending October 31, 1928, page 373, the recent report of the *Canadian Annual Review*, we find that, sales for the last five months showed an increase of over six million dollars or 34.5 per cent over the corresponding period in the previous year."

There were about five hundred thousand permits issued during this period, there were thirty-nine new stores and twenty-seven brewery warehouses open during this period.

And furthermore, it isn't government revenue that is being regulated, for the net profit for 1928 was approximately eight million dollars. Eight million dollars derived by the Ontario government.

Again we would ask just what it is that the Ontario system regulates? We maintain that the Ontario system does not regulate. We refer you again to George E. Foster, who says: "Government sale is the prime motive under the Ontario system; government control is mere camouflage; the elements behind the new legislation are not seeking government control, they are out for government sale. And the government itself has in mind and motive the replenishment of its revenues, and the more it sells the greater its income. The whole machinery of the commission is worked to promote sales and increase government revenues and it is bravely succeeding."

They have told you that crime is increasing under prohibition, but according to the United States Census Bulletin we find that the rate of decrease for all commitments for all crimes is 37.7 per cent. And yet these gentlemen will tell you crime is increasing. But according to Judge William M. Gemmell, of the Superior Court of Cook County, Illinois, perhaps the greatest authority on crime in America, he estimates that there are three hundred thousand fewer arrests for drunkenness to-day than in the average license year. Therefore, we can see that arrests for drunkenness have decreased greatly and not increased at all, as the Affirmative would have you believe.

Ladies and Gentlemen, these men have not spoken of the Ontario system thus far. They have told you one or two facts but have not read to you the entire law. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we maintain our states should not be allowed to adopt the Ontario system of control because the Ontario system is a failure. It has failed in Ontario and it will fail here in the United States. It is apparent that Ontario, when enacting this law, had in mind a law which would produce temperance in drink and respect for law and order. However, upon a careful examination of the facts as they really exist in Ontario today, we find that the Ontario system has failed to produce temperance in drink, it has failed to produce respect for law and order, while on the contrary it has resulted in an increase in the consumption of liquor as well as an increase in the number of violations of the liquor law. Now, that the consumption of liquor is increased under the Ontario system is evidenced by the further fact, as our second speaker has pointed out, in June, 1927, there were eighteen stores while to-day there are operating legally in Ontario one hundred seventeen government stores. Now, let us keep in mind at the same time that Ontario is a province just one-half the size of our state of Ohio, yet in that small province there was over fifty million dollars worth of liquor consumed during the first year, while even a more significant fact than that, during the second year there was an actual increase of over one million dollars of liquor sold per month. This is an increase of 34.5 per cent.

Ladies and Gentlemen, do you wish to adopt a system of liquor control here in the United States which would result in a 34 per cent annual increase in the consumption of intoxicating liquors? I am wondering where such a system would ultimately lead us. The gentlemen of the Affirmative would have you believe that under the Ontario system there would be no violation of the liquor law. The evidence shows that this is not true, for, since the inauguration of the Ontario system, the number of violations of the liquor law has steadily increased.

Now again, just for convenience, we will cite one of the authorities which the Affirmative asked us for. According to the report of the Provincial Chief of Police of Ontario, we find that during the first five months of government control the number of convictions for violation of the liquor law increased at the rate of one hundred per month, while under this system of government control we find that during the fifth month the

number of convictions nearly doubled the number of convictions during the first month.

Thus, Ladies and Gentlemen, we can see at a glance that the Ontario system has failed to produce the results for which it was adopted, it has failed to produce temperance in drinking, it has failed to produce respect for law and order. It is for these reasons we maintain that the Ontario system will fail here in the United States. In the first place the number of government stores would increase; in the second place, consumption and sale of liquor would increase. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is another reason why we maintain that the Ontario system would fail here in the United States. A similar system, Ladies and Gentlemen, has already been tried here in our own nation. It has been tried and failed. The system to which I refer was known as the South Carolina Liquor Dispensary. Now, the purposes and the principle of these two systems, the Ontario system, were exactly the same, both intended to produce temperance in drink, and both intended to produce respect for law and order. However, permit me to quote statistics which will reveal to you the deplorable results of such a system here in the United States in South Carolina, for during the first ten years of this state liquor dispensary the drinking bill of South Carolina increased 41 per cent, while according to the report of the attorney general of the state, we find that during these same first ten years crime in the state of South Carolina increased 350 per cent, while the population increased less than 17 per cent.

Ladies and Gentlemen, those are the results of such a system here in the United States, not in theory, but in actual practice. What did the people of South Carolina do? After trying out the state liquor dispensary for a period of twenty-four years, a system of government control under conditions giving it every possible opportunity for success, they voted to abandon the policy by a majority of more than two to one. Yet at the same time let us keep in mind that the South Carolina system was tried out under the most favorable conditions and with the most powerful support. The plan had every advantage conceivable for its success and yet it was a miserable failure.

Therefore, Ladies and Gentlemen, we maintain that our states should not be allowed to adopt the Ontario system of government control, first, because Ontario system is failing in Ontario, and second, because a similar system has already been

tried and failed here in the United States. Now the question arises naturally, what is left for us to do? The answer is simply this, we must keep prohibition. However, at the same time we realize just as well as you that we must improve upon our present prohibition law. To-day, Ladies and Gentlemen, as the Affirmative asked, what are we going to do about prohibition? We would say to-day there are many plans being inaugurated to perfect our present system, the transfer of the enforcement department from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice, where it logically belongs has been accomplished, severe penalties by the recent Jones Act were passed by our last Congress, and bordering nations, such as Canada, to-day are making plans to help the United States enforce her law by prohibiting importations to this country. And we would add to this our own suggestion, that the American public be thoroughly educated to the evils of liquor, and second, that our Federal Government, our State Government, as well as individuals themselves help to enforce this law. This is no more than our duty. In this program, Ladies and Gentlemen, we see a system which is not only well designed and well meaning, but a system which is successful.

Permit me to briefly summarize the entire case as laid before you to-night. The first speaker has shown that prohibition is a result of a long gradual process of development, not something come overnight, and total prohibition is necessary because of our complicated civilization, and our second speaker has pointed out that we should not adopt the Ontario system because it leads away from temperance and sobriety, and I have pointed out that we should not adopt it because it is a failure in Ontario and has been tried in this country and failed.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

L. J. Sorenson, Ohio State

FRIENDS: I wish to point out once more, that not one of our questions has as yet been answered. Are our opponents afraid to answer them, or are they evading them for an unfair advantage in their last speech? We have asked you men of the Affirmative; do you or do you not favor the principle of total

prohibition? They would have you, according to the last speaker for their side, adopt the government control of liquor so as to take the liquor traffic out of the hands of organized crime and put it into the hands of the government. Would you not then have, instead of the ideals they gave us, government as well as liquor traffic controlled by organized crimes? As was pointed out, in one of our constructive speeches, the very plebiscite in which Ontario adopted this system about which our opponents are so fanatic, was supported by thousands of dollars contributed from the leading distilleries within the province of Ontario. Why, we would like to know, under the sun should a company support with thousands of dollars a law, the very purpose of which is to deprive them of their own business? There is something wrong, or else people are far more optimistic in Ontario than they are in the United States.

However, the prime purpose of this system in Ontario is not government control. The prime purpose, according to George E. Foster, perhaps Canada's greatest living statesman, is government sale. He says the government control is a mere camouflage; that the elements behind the new legislature are not seeking control but are out for government sale because it increases government revenue. Once they have in their possession this government revenue, how are you going to get legislators to deprive themselves of that income and take one step further toward temperance whether the people want it or not?

The Affirmative say that prohibition has failed because in some instances it is violated. Such reasoning is absolutely false. As Professor Thomas N. Carver of Harvard has pointed out: "If the prohibition law were not difficult to enforce there would be no strong reason for having such a law." And continuing, "But this widespread craving for liquor, which tends to unfit men for functioning in an interlocking civilization (such as we have to-day) furnishes a strong reason for a prohibition law and a heavy expenditure for its enforcement."

They say social conditions are worse under prohibition than before, but that is only their assertion, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let us go to a prominent man on this campus, Professor Frederick L. Paxson, head of your history department who recently wrote in a book on recent history of the United States: "It was claimed that crime and political corruption were becoming worse

rather than better. The facts were so largely obscured by passion and misrepresentation as to be difficult to establish. One eminent economist, Prof. Irving Fisher of Yale, examined them and concluded that prohibition at its worst was nevertheless much better than anything conceived to-day."

They say the Ontario system is successful. How do they account for the following editorial appearing in the greatest newspaper in the province, *The New Outlook* of Toronto: "To-day the roads of Ontario are littered with thousands of empty beer and whiskey bottles. Ontario sells \$50,000,000 worth of liquor annually. Is it any wonder that thousands of youths are becoming drunkards and the number of automobile accidents caused by drinking is increasing appallingly?"

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

David Rabinovitz, Wisconsin

We presented a new problem to you to-night and it seems as though there is some opposition to it, especially from the gentlemen on this side of the platform. We could keep on talking from to-day until doomsday on the evils of alcohol and benefits of prohibition, but the question to-night is, are you enforcing what you say ought to be enforced? We could show millions of instances of how alcohol is an evil, and how it is detrimental to our poor Henry Ford, how it decreases consumption of his factory, but the fact remains people are drinking to-day and will drink whether alcohol is bad or good. The question to-night is mainly this, how are you doing to do away with the present evil? The very fact that you have shown us so much liquor is consumed in Canada is proof of the fact that it is being controlled to-day. It shows at least we know how much people drink, but God knows in this country, no one knows how much we drink. We can not know when it is being sold secretly in speakeasies, by the private and wholesale bootlegger. The question is, how are you going to do away with the present evil? We at least have a control system where everything is sold under the permit system. They ask us how can we tell how much an individual can hold, but the fact remains that under a restricted

system where each individual gets a certain permit, we control the sale of liquor to that particular individual, by that means we do away with the greatest evil that exists in this country to-day, the underground illegal liquor traffic. Under our system such an institution as Al Capone and Joe Saltis of Chicago can not exist. We fail to see how any argument for prohibition can dispose of the fact that the Ontario system will do away with these evils. They have made a mere assertion that the Ontario system is not working, but we have pointed out to you one of the greatest proofs that shows whether a system works or not, the people in Ontario are behind the plan.

They ask us, are we in favor of prohibition or not? What difference does it make if we haven't got prohibition or not? What difference does it make if we haven't got prohibition to-day if we say yes or no, what difference does it make? We haven't prohibition in this country. We would like to see it just as well as the Negative, but that isn't the question. It isn't the question whether prohibition is good or bad, the question is, is prohibition being enforced to-day? We do not maintain our system will do away with every little evil present to-day, but it is certainly a known fact that if a man is drowning he will not ask for a luxurious yacht but will take a plank. We are offering you something to-day which will relieve us of our difficulty. They may paint pretty pictures for us of conditions as they exist to-day, but we have told you in our second speech that members of the Illinois Crime Commission composed of eminent lawyers and jurists have said the main cause for crime in Chicago today is bootlegging. It is easy to see how that is possible because out of bootlegging the criminals are able to make the money with which they can bribe officials and carry out other illegal functions. And so we ask you again to consider from your own experience, the stories one hears from day to day of the corruption and illegal practices of our people that have arisen through prohibition. We need not say anything further on this proposition but that we have done away with the present evil and under our system the government can see these illegal things going on, and where things are open so that the people can see them, we maintain that a situation under such conditions will be very much better than it is to-day. I thank you.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

J R. Allen, Ohio State

We asked the Affirmative to tell us whether they believed in the principle of total prohibition, and they turn around and ask us, what difference does it make? We request them, to answer yes or no and we will tell what the difference is. The Affirmative say prohibition is not being enforced, but according to Chairman Wickersham of the Hoover law enforcement commission, and incidentally I consider him a good authority, reporting just last Monday, there is a steady improvement in prohibition, and one of Chairman Wickersham's most competent investigators announced that prohibition is being enforced better than any other federal law. These are conclusions drawn from a thorough investigation of the facts as they really are.

We also agree with ex-President Coolidge, in his statement to the governors on October 20, 1923, that prohibition is enforceable. "A government which does not enforce its laws is unworthy of the name of a government and can not expect to hold the support of its own citizens or the respect of the informed opinion of the world."

The Affirmative will tell you that the Ontario system regulates but Senator Borah, in quoting Sir Hugh McDonald, said: "There is just as much unlawful drinking under government control as under any other system. The present law was, in the very nature of things, difficult of enforcement. It was far less difficult to secure conviction under prohibition than under government control."

From a report of the Chief Constable of the city of Toronto for 1927, comes this statement; "However, in spite of the activity of the police, illicit liquor selling by the glass or in small quantities is still evident, chiefly by reason of an individual being able to buy large quantities daily from the stores." J. N. McClean, in the report of the Government Liquor Board of Ontario, says the illicit manufacture of liquor continues; that there is more bootlegging than in 1915, more moonshine and deleterious substance than in 1915.

There has been an increase in crime, according to George E. Foster, Canada's greatest living statesman to-day. There were

6094 prosecutions in the first year and one-half of the Ontario system. From every government sale province in Canada comes evidence of increasing "blind pigs," bootleggers, and stills.

Albert Shaw, editor of the *Review of Reviews* says: "Let it be remembered that if we should adopt the present Canadian system we should still have to deal with rum runners, bootleggers, moonshiners, speakeasies, and filthy night clubs. The problems of enforcing law under a closely restricted dispensary system would resemble in most ways those existing under the prohibition system."

The Ontario system is an utter farce. In Ontario, according to the latest report of the Liquor Board, "the short-circuiting of liquor presumed to be for export has taken place to an amount entirely unascertainable in 1928," and there is still more bootlegging on a small scale than there was in 1915.

The liquor traffic is getting a strong hold on all Dominion politics which is leading the different dominion governments to raise revenue from making them their actual agents in exploiting those very vices for greed and gain.

In Ontario it is obvious that drunkenness is increasing. Here are some extracts from papers in Ontario:

Toronto *Telegram* of September 6: "The cells overflowed with prisoners this morning. Eighty-nine of those on the calendar were before Magistrate Cohen for drunkenness."

On October 1 the Toronto dailies carried the news item that "there were fifty-eight persons in the city jail, more than there were beds for, and the prisoners were sleeping on the stone floors in the corridors."

On November 2, 1927, there were 186 prisoners in the Toronto City jail as compared with 128 last year; and 362 at the Toronto Jail farm as compared with 228 last year.

The Toronto *Star* of September 6 says, "Eighteen were dead and thirty-eight injured as a result of accidents in Ontario during the week end."

Speaking at the Empire Club of Toronto, Mr. J. E. Hetherington is reported to have said, "If you would abolish accidents then you should abolish government control. Accidents due to drunkenness have increased ten-fold since government control was introduced."

The Affirmative have told you the Ontario system regulates. I ask you, what does it regulate? It doesn't regulate crime, it

doesn't regulate sale, it doesn't regulate the amount of profit taken, it doesn't regulate wreckless driving nor it doesn't regulate the amount of people who get drunk. It doesn't regulate anything, and still our opponents would have this system introduced into the United States.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

T. C. Kammholz, Wisconsin

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The principle of prohibition, apparently, is still with us. We beg to remind you that the question for debate to-night is the Ontario system in place of our present situation. That is what we are interested in. We have adduced evidence to show that conditions in America to-day are undesirable, and the only counter evidence the Negative has produced is the report of the Census Bureau for 1926 which says that crime has increased. We look at the 1929 Bureau of Census Report and show you that crimes, drunkenness, and all forms of corruption have increased under prohibition.

My friends, our worthy opponents have asked us to read you the Ontario Act. Here it is, 141 pages of it. We are to debate here to-night, not to stage a reading contest, and we have explained the main principles of that act. This is a law passed by the Canadian legislature and I beg to remind you all laws are very difficult to understand. We will admit conditions are not perfect in Canada. If they were perfect there would be no need for this debate to-night,—we would have adopted the Ontario system long ago, but let me read a statement from the report of the Liquor Commissioner of Ontario; who says, "Most of this alcohol smuggled into Canada comes to us from the United States."

My friends, the bootleggers are making so much money and competition is so keen, they have got to expand the field of business and are going to Canada!

The Negative have attempted to tell you that the Ontario system will prove a failure in this country because South Carolina twenty-five years ago made an unsuccessful attempt. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is true, South Carolina did have a system of control, but that is only half the story. The government,

in 1905, when South Carolina adopted this system, did sell liquor but the government alone did not sell. There was at that time no law, state or federal, which prohibited private interests, bootleggers from outside of the state, from shipping liquor to those individuals within the state who wanted to consume it, and we find from the statement of the governor of North Carolina, Governor Tillman, that at that time approximately 50 per cent of the liquor consumed in North Carolina was liquor purchased not from the government but liquor shipped into the state by private interests. I have here a United States Supreme Court Report, 242 U. S. 311, in which the court explains how at that time there was no law which prohibited this competition between the government system and private interests; and that competition Ladies and Gentlemen, is the very factor which ruined the South Carolina system. Under the system we propose, the Ontario system, there will be no private interests competing with the government! We are going to have liquor control and absolute liquor control by the government. Compare that, if you will, with the South Carolina system that was but half successful by reason of its inherent defects!

Our situation to-day is the problem that confronts us, and we are seeking a practical solution to that situation. We are not interested in the principle of prohibition in theory or in practice. The Negative have been arguing all evening about theory, is prohibition, as such, good? That isn't the basis of argument here to-night. We are interested in what we are going to do with conditions to-day. If we face the situation squarely there is but one inevitable truth that confronts us, namely something must be done with conditions to-day. We told you about those conditions. The Negative have disputed them in only one instance, and I have given you authority which contradicts that instance. In view of this situation we have a system that has worked in Ontario, that is working in Ontario to-day, and we ask that it be adopted in the United States. It will work here, Ladies and Gentlemen, because fundamentally it is sound and it is working in practice in Ontario.

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

C. H. Schug, Ohio State

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Surely, I do not blame the gentlemen of the Affirmative for not wanting to read the one hundred

forty pages to you; that would be very tiresome to you, but we would at least like to have them give you the principles of the Ontario system in detail. If they know them by heart, all right, let them give them to you. They have failed to show anything inherent in the Ontario system by which it will succeed where they say we have failed under the prohibition law. This they have failed to do.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we fail to see how one can remedy the amount of intoxication by increasing the supply of the commodity that produces intoxication. We can not see that. At the same time we would remind the gentlemen once more that they are totally disregarding our questions. We asked them to tell us if they were opposed to prohibition and if so why? We asked in our first speech, our second speech, our third speech, and in our first and second rebuttals, and I still ask them and they have not answered. At the same time we would like to ask that other question, who in this world is so intelligent that he can decide what individual can consume a certain amount of liquor in a given time without over-indulgence? The reason they don't answer is because it is impossible for anyone to do that.

They say South Carolina is different from the Ontario system. We maintain that the principles and purposes of these two systems are exactly the same, and that is what we are discussing to-night, principles and purposes. Under both systems liquors must be shown by analysis to be pure and unadulterated. Liquor is sold by the package only, and the purchaser shall not open a package on the premises. A purchaser, before he may be served, must present a request giving his name, age, residence, kind of liquor wanted and for whose use. The dispenser shall require the identification of the applicant if unknown and no minor may be served. Both systems report all requests monthly to the county auditor, both systems under government control, both systems regulated by means of permit, both systems intended to produce temperance in drinking and respect for law and order, and both systems failed. We still maintain the principles and purposes of these two systems are exactly the same and can not be changed.

We ask you to consider what the Gentlemen of the Affirmative are advocating to-night; that our states be allowed to adopt a system which has been tried in one place outside of South Carolina, in a foreign nation, in a province largely rural, not

urban, in a rural community one sixteenth as densely populated as the state of Wisconsin, and last of all, a system which has been tried for two and one-half years and is failing. This is the type they would have you set up here in our country. We maintain none of the individual states should be allowed to adopt the Ontario system because the Ontario system is inherently harmful, as we have shown. We are as much interested in the welfare of these three men we are debating to-night as we are in any other men in Ohio, just as interested in the citizens of Wisconsin as the citizens in Ohio, and we must remember first of all that we are citizens of the United States and second, we are citizens of the states of Wisconsin and Ohio respectively. I realize how absurd it is for me to stand up here and ask you this question, but I am forced to ask this question, however absurd it may be. Can you realize or imagine the government of this great nation of ours, or any individual state, in the liquor business, manufacturing and selling intoxicating liquor and deriving a profit from the American family pocket-book in the liquor industry? Ladies and Gentlemen, when our great nation, our government goes into such a business, that is when my head bows down in shame. When that time comes I no longer wish to be considered a citizen of the United States.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have shown you to-night that prohibition is a result of long, gradual process of development; we have shown you that the Ontario system leads away from the principles of temperance and sobriety, and that the Ontario system is failing in Ontario. Crime has increased, drunkenness has increased, bootlegging has increased, debauching of womanhood has increased, government stores have increased, warehouses have increased. These, Ladies and Gentlemen, are just a few of the evils under the Ontario system; evils which we have not built up from our imagination, but which we have shown, by authoritative testimony, really do exist. Add to these evils the fact that the system has already failed in its first trial in the United States, and we have ample reason for opposing its adoption at the present time.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

J. Gunnar Back, Wisconsin

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I wonder that the heart of the member of the opposition who just left the floor does not

bow down in shame at the fact that Al Capone is selling \$70,000,000 worth of illegal liquor yearly in the United States, that his heart does not ache at the fact that bootleggers and speakeasies despite our dry status are selling poisonous liquor all over the United States to-day, that the man or woman who wants a drink can get it, in open defiance of the law. We have been asked the question, who is going to tell when a man is drunk and refuse him a sale? In Ontario last year over five thousand people were refused liquor in Ontario liquor stores. In Wisconsin, how many people were refused the sale of liquor in speakeasies last year? In Ontario we found over five thousand people were refused sale by liquor store operators who know when to tell a man to stop buying. In the Ontario liquor stores there is a blacklist of people to be refused sale. If the clerk does not refuse sale to the blacklisted he will lose his job.

We have heard repeatedly argued to-night that government control will increase consumption, but we have shown from the actual figures of the Ontario Liquor Board, that the consumption of hard liquor since 1926 has decreased from .7 per person to .4. Those are actual figures from a government report showing that consumption has been reduced in Ontario.

We have heard the testimony of George E. Foster, saying the principle of government control is wrong because the government has entered for profit. No less an important person than Mr. Hanna, D. B. Hanna, first head of the Government Control Board had this to say at the outset: "It is my hope that as time goes on, people will use less and less liquor. The government is not seeking to sell as much liquor as possible. Former law abiding citizens, who protected bootleggers before 1926, are aiding us."

It isn't the purpose of the Ontario plan to drum up liquor business. If there were an intention to make money, why isn't liquor in Ontario sold in taverns and stores as in Quebec? Under the Ontario system there is no sale of liquor in public, and obviously there would be if the object was to make money.

The argument of the last opposition speaker has shown a comparison of the South Carolina system with that of the Ontario system, but he forgot to tell you that in South Carolina the government did not have complete monopoly. Any person who wanted to buy liquor by mail outside of the state was allowed to do so. One of our speakers has named the court

upholding that decision. People in South Carolina were permitted to buy from outside the state and did not have to buy from the government. In Canada not one drop of liquor can be sold outside of a government store and every single quart sold is recorded on the customer's permit.

The opposition has argued that the Ontario system has failed because there are bootleggers. The only testimony they gave was some one thousand stills variously discovered. Al Capone's stills alone made seventy million dollars in Chicago last year. Henry Strawn, who was recently deposed as Federal dry agent from Green Bay, testified that there were one thousand cases of whiskey coming through every day from Canada, and in Fords most of them. Recently a still with a capacity of six hundred gallons a day was found in Milwaukee, and in Chicago recently forty thousand gallons of stored alcohol were found in one place. That is why we oppose prohibition. While there may be one thousand stills in Ontario, there were two hundred and fifty thousand gallons made in one Detroit still alone per week in the United States of America. The principle of prohibition has failed as far as actual practice is concerned.

We have heard it argued that the distilleries' interests are behind politics in Canada. Do you realize that when Mayor Dever ran against Thompson, a number of years ago in Chicago, \$100,000 was offered Mr. Dever by bootlegging interests if he would give up the race. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars were offered to Mr. Bottomley if he would keep his eyes off one plant. That is the comparison which bears weight when political graft in Ontario and the United States is considered.

In closing the case for the Affirmative let me point out that before 1920 thirty-three states were reasonably dry. The national prohibition law did not dry up the remaining fifteen states. The wet states refused to obey the law; states dry became wetter. According to the *Literary Digest* poll at the present time the popular vote is three to one for modification. Clearly there is a demand that something be done about the present situation.

MR. WILLIAMS—You have heard the arguments. We are now to have the score and the decision. We have Professor Alan H. Monroe acting as critic judge.

CRITIC JUDGE

Professor Monroe

Now that the tumult and the shouting has died and before the captains and kings depart, I presume it is essential that we discover whether what they have done is to be remembered. Therefore I am going to attempt, as briefly as possible, to analyze the type of presentation which the gentlemen used, the sort of argument they employed, and the methods used to attack the opposition. I wish to call attention to the fact that my decision this evening is not for the purpose of telling you whether I personally believe that the Ontario system should be made optional for the states, but rather which of the two teams on the platform, in my opinion, did the better debating. Therefore, whether you believe one way or the other, remember my decision is not on that point, but rather on the type of debating that is done.

The first thing I shall mention, I think, is the matter of the poise in presentation used by the two sides. I can't help but feel that even in a debate, where there is apt to be considerable excitement, speakers ought to be a little careful about the names they call the opposition. I also feel that, while it is perhaps not necessarily unethical according to the strict rules of debating, to stretch out one's last sentence for a considerable time, I am satisfied it is slightly poor persuasion to do so. Perhaps we ought to declare a five yard penalty on the gentlemen of the Negative on that particular score. However, that isn't what I am going to decide the debate on. If that were the function of the judge it would be very simple. All he would have to do would be to hold a stop watch and that would be the end of it.

I feel that the type of speaking done by the gentlemen on both sides was rather good this evening. I thought that a slight superiority on that score was manifested by the Affirmative, principally because of a greater degree of poise. The gentlemen of the Negative, although effective in getting their arguments across to the audience, gave the impression of being just a little bit over anxious that those arguments should sink home, and occasionally were apt to press too hard on their points. That is, with respect to presentation.

However, the fundamental purpose of debating, of course, is the clash of minds, not the clash of mouths, and therefore let me go a little deeper into this matter. As to the case presented by the two teams I think each was equally clear, each equally supported with evidence. It seems to me that on the basis of analysis we had such a situation as this: the Affirmative told you that they are proposing to allow wet states to adopt the Ontario plan, and I think it was made clear rather early in the debate that it was not to be forced on every state. The Negative didn't object to that; therefore I must assume they agreed to it, and yet, it seemed to me throughout the debate, they were attempting to prove that the Ontario plan adopted *throughout the United States* would be bad. I don't believe that throughout the debate they actually met the Affirmative's analysis of the optional phase of the proposition. I feel that the Affirmative had an advantage in the case itself.

I thought there were three good rebuttals on the platform this evening. I believe the second negative speaker made a good rebuttal speech, and I believe the second and third Affirmative speakers made good rebuttal speeches. I mean that they were getting down to the controversial points and attacking them, not just any controversial points but the important ones. Those three speakers did just that. I felt that the other speakers tended to jump from one minor point to another and I would say that would give again a slight advantage to the Affirmative team in the matter of debating skill and tactics.

And now, let me come to the one thing which seemed to stand out throughout the debate. These are perhaps minor points, but straws in the wind, compared to the matter of debating skill. First of all, these questions, as I have them here. There were three questions asked by the Negative. First of all, they asked, "Are you, or are you not opposed to prohibition?" To which the Affirmative replied, "Why is that important inasmuch as prohibition is not being enforced?" It seemed to me that the gentlemen of the Negative might have answered that question as to why the Affirmative should be asked to answer it. That is, mere repetition of the question does not force the opposition to answer it. The Affirmative showed good reason why they should not answer it, and one negative speaker answered that by saying "If you will answer it then we will tell you why." That sounds to me a little bit the sort of thing we don't like to

have lawyers do, and it gives a poor impression. Again the Negative asked the Affirmative, "Just what is the Ontario plan?" The third negative speaker said, "They have failed to read the Ontario Act to you," when that has been adequately answered, and the rebuttal speakers, several of them, pressed home the point that the Affirmative had not outlined the Ontario plan. I realize a person in a debate is apt not to hear everything, but I got the outline of the plan as the third speaker of the Affirmative gave it, but to be fair I do believe the Affirmative might justifiably have outlined at least the major portion of it earlier in the case. I think they did place an unfair burden on the audience to continue two-thirds of the debate before explaining the system. Nevertheless, when they came out and explained it the Negative should have been satisfied and attacked what they had presented instead of asking them to go further into detail.

Because in my estimation the Affirmative had a slight advantage in delivery due to a greater degree of poise; because although the two cases were evenly balanced, the Affirmative stated and upheld its analysis of the question a bit more effectively; and because when it came to debating tactics and skill, the Affirmative showed a better command of the situation, I give a close decision to the Affirmative team.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ONTARIO SYSTEM OF LIQUOR CONTROL

BIBLIOGRAPHY

United States. Library of Congress. Prohibition: a recent list of books. 4p. typew. 50c. O. 2, '28. (Obtainable only thru the Public Affairs Information Service, 11 W. 40th St. New York)

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment. Government liquor control in Canada. pa. gratis. The Association. 21 E. 40th St. N.Y. '29.

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment. Last outposts of prohibition in Canada; Nova Scotia and Prince Edwards Island. pa. gratis. The Association. 21 E. 40th St. N.Y. '29.

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment. Quebec system: a study in liquor control. 40p. The Association. 21 E. 40th St. N.Y. '29.

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment. Research department. Canada liquor crossing the border. 28p. The Association. Lenox Bldg. Wash. D.C. '29.

Beman, L. T. Prohibition. (Reference Shelf. vol. V. no. 1) 154p. 90c. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '27.

Blakemore, A. W. National prohibition, the Volstead act annotated. 3d ed. cliii, 1047p. \$12. Matthew Bender. N.Y. '27.

Brennan, F. P. Ontario liquor control act, 1927, annotated. \$5. Carswell. Toronto. '28.

Brown, R. E., comp. Why prohibition? 9-160p. pa. \$1. Independent Press. 2182 E. 9th St. Cleveland.

Calkins, Raymond. Substitutes for the saloon. 2d ed. rev. \$1.75. Houghton Mifflin. N.Y. '19.

- Cherrington, E. H. Evolution of prohibition in the United States of America. \$2.50. pa. \$1.75. American Issue Pub. Co. (Anti-Saloon League of America). Westerville, Ohio. '20.
- Cobb, S. H. Theory of prohibition. 10p. pa. Association against the prohibition amendment. 21 E. 40th St. N.Y. '29.
- Crowther, Samuel. Prohibition and prosperity. vi,81p. John Day. N.Y. '30.
- Dorr, R. C. Drink: coercion or control? 330p. \$2.50. Stokes. N.Y. '29.
- Durant, W. C., ed. Law observance. 573p. Durant Award Office. 250 W. 57th St. N.Y. '29.
- Feldman, H. Prohibition, its economic and industrial aspects. 415p. D. Appleton. N.Y. '27.
- Fisher, Irving and Brougham, H. B. Noble experiment. xlv, 492p. \$2. Alcohol Information Committee. 150 5th Ave. N.Y. '30.
- Fisher, Irving and Brougham, H. B. Prohibition still at its worst. xxvii,358p. \$1.50. Alcohol Information Committee. 150 5th Ave. N.Y. '28.
- Godwin, E. What is prohibition? 37p. National W.C.T.U. Pub. House. Evanston, Ill. '29.
- Hose, R. E. Prohibition or control? Canada's experience with the liquor problem, 1921-1927. 132p. \$3. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '28.
- Ludovici, A. M. Man's descent from the gods; or the complete case against prohibition. \$4. Knopf. N.Y. '21.
- McAdoo, W. G. Challenge; liquor and lawlessness versus constitutional government. x,305p. \$2. Century. N.Y. '28.
- McBain, H. L. Prohibition; legal and illegal. ix,171p. \$2. Macmillan. N.Y. '28.
- Nelson, L. E. Federal liquor laws. li,1089p. \$13. Callaghan. Chic. '30.
- Ontario. Liquor control board. First report, June 1, 1927-October 31, 1927. 15p. King's Printer. Toronto. '28.
- Ontario. Liquor control board. Third report, November 1, 1928-October 31, 1929. 28p. King's Printer. Toronto. '30.
- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1924-1925. Amendment of the Volstead act. Vol. XI. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '25.

- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1926-1927. Vol. XIII. Repeal of the prohibition amendment. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '27.
- Shadwell, Arthur. Drink in 1914-1922. \$3.75. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '23.
- Standard encyclopedia of the alcohol problem. E. H. Cherrington, editor-in-chief. 5 vols. \$37.50. American Issue Pub. Co. (Anti-Saloon League of America) Westerville, Ohio. '25.
- Steuart, T. J. Wayne Wheeler, dry boss. 304p. \$3. F. H. Revell. N.Y. '28.
- Stevenson, A. E. States' rights and national prohibition. 157p. \$2.50. Clark Boardman. N.Y. '27.
- Tietzort, F. J., ed. Temperance or prohibition? xx,397p. \$1. Hearst temperance contest committee. The Editor. 220 South St. N.Y. '29.
- Vecki, V. G. Alcohol and prohibition in their relation to civilization and the art of living. \$2. J. B. Lippincott. Phila. '23.
- Warner, Harry Sheldon. Prohibition, an adventure in freedom. 265p. \$2. American Issue Pub. Co. (Anti-Saloon League of America) Westerville, Ohio. '28.
- Willebrandt, M. W. Inside of prohibition. 347p. \$2. Bobbs-Merrill. Indianapolis. '29.

PERIODICALS

- American City. 40:154. F. '29. Prohibition's darkest of nights.
- American Journal of International Law. 24:131-3. Ja. '30. Positions of Canada and the United States in the matter of trade in alcoholic beverages. P. B. Potter.
- American Mercury. 15:385-94. D. '28. Psychology of prohibition. R. Pearl.
- American Mercury. 17:271-7. Jl. '29. Art of drink on the border. O. P. White.
- American Mercury. 19:92-100. Ja. '30. Report from North Carolina. B. D. MacNeill.
- Atlantic Monthly. 138:1-11. Jl. '26. Liberty and sovereignty. G. W. Martin.
- Atlantic Monthly. 143:145-51. F. '29. Reconstruction and prohibition. A. L. Lowell.

- Business Week. p. 35. Mr. 19, '30. Canada to stop booze flow.
- Canadian Forum. 10:117-18. Ja. '30. Plebiscite à la Nova Scotia.
- Catholic World. 125:543-4. Jl. '27. Fanaticism of prohibition.
- Century. 113:474-84. F. '27. Bishop's beer; temperance experiment and its bearing on prohibition. A. K. Fallows.
- Century. 115:641-53. Ap. '28. Eighteenth amendment is void. H. A. Johnston.
- Century. 118:129-40. Je. '29. Indictment of prohibition. J. S. Auerbach.
- Christian Century. 46:1077-8. S. 4, '29. Debits and credits of Canadian liquor.
- Christian Century. 46:1109-10. S. 11, '29. Will the Canadian churches help?
- Christian Century. 46:11332. O. 30, '29. How Canada has solved the liquor problem.
- Christian Century. 46:11371-2. N. 6, '29. How it works in Canada.
- Christian Century. 47:392-3. Mr. 26, '30. Canada, a good neighbor; measure for refusal of clearance to rum-runners.
- Christian Century. 47:485. Ap. 16, '30. Mr. Dupont solves the liquor problem.
- Christian Century. 47:581-3. My. 7, '30. Wet polls, another racket.
- Christian Century. 47:657-8. My. 21, '30. Philosophy for prohibition. N. H. Cruikshank.
- Collier's. 78:8. Jl. 31, '26. We're going to stay dry. J. Cannon, jr.
- Collier's. 78:9. Jl. 31, '26. We're going to stay wet. W. C. Bruce.
- Collier's. 82:8-9. O. 27, '28. —and mix with fresh water. J. B. Kennedy.
- Collier's. 84:74. S. 21, '29. Drinking isn't compulsory.
- Collier's. 85:10-11. Ja. 4, '30. This damned traffic. W. G. Shepherd.
- Commerce and Finance. 18:2368. O. 30, '29. How many bootleggers? B. A. Richardson.
- Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 128:1672. Mr. 16, '29. Commission to inquire into prohibition enforcement will consider other branches of federal law enforcement.

- Commonweal. 9:389-90. F. 6, '29. Naive statesmen; three-day liquor smuggling conference with Canadian officials.
- Commonweal. 9:616-18. Ap. 3, '29. Who shall obey the law? J. A. Ryan.
- Commonweal. 10:102-3. My. 29, '29. Why shall obey the law? Reply. A. Wagner.
- Commonweal. 10:402-3. Ag. 21, '29. Rum-running at Detroit. J. C. Calahan, jr.
- Commonweal. 10:499-501. S. 18, '29. Wisconsin plan. George Westervelt.
- Commonweal. 11:72-4. N. 20, '29. Evolution of a moderate drinker. J. E. Ross.
- Commonweal. 11:170. D. 11, '29. Canada dry.
- Commonweal. 11:497-8. Mr. 5, '30. Cloud from Canada. D. C. Seitz. 11:588-9. Mr. 26, '30. Discussion.
- Commonweal. 12:145-6. Je. 11, '30. Mr. Morrow speaks out.
- Commonweal. 12:162. Je. 11, '30. Temperance versus prohibition. W. Everett.
- Contemporary Review. 129:712-21. Je. '26. Crisis of prohibition. S. K. Ratcliffe.
- Current History. 25:1-5. O. '26. Are the wets hypocrites in their plea for state rights? W. B. Wheeler.
- Current History. 25:305-9. N. '26. Case of the wets for state rights; Chief Justice Marshall's view on prohibition. M. P. Andrews.
- Current History. 28:27-30. Ap. '28. Canada's retreat from prohibition. J. M. Campbell.
- Current History. 28:537-47. Jl. '28. Do women want national prohibition? M. L. Gross; Mrs. H. W. Peabody.
- Current History. 28:585-98. Jl. '28. Prohibition and the constitution; debate. R. R. Lounsbury; A. E. Stevenson.
- Current History. 29:7-17. O. '28. Governor Smith's proposals to change the prohibition laws; debate. G. G. Battle; O. S. Poland.
- Current History. 29:529-34. Ja. '29. Prohibition victorious. E. H. Cherrington.
- Current History. 30:781-96. Ag. '29. Enforcement of prohibition. W. C. Bruce; S. High.
- Current History. 31:64-79. O. '29. The Canadian liquor system. A. E. Cooke; C. Stanley; E. H. Cherrington.

- Current History. 32:703-6. Jl. '30. Belgium's anti-liquor laws. A. Racine.
- Current History. 32:712-16. Jl. '30. Canada's cooperation in prohibition enforcement. R. L. Jones.
- Economist. 105:732-3. O. '29. '27. Brewery profits.
- Economist. 106:9-11. Ja. 7, '28. Distillery profits.
- Economist. 110:sup46. F. 15, '30. Beer, wine and spirits, 1929. 1929.
- Economist. 110:1106-7. My. 17, '30. Liquor legislation in Switzerland.
- Edinburgh Review. 243:102-22. Ja. '26. Fruits of prohibition. E. E. Stoll.
- English Review. 50:318-29. Mr. '30. Searchlight on prohibition. F. H. Shaw.
- Forum. 81:257-62. My. '29. Can prohibition succeed? a Socratic dialogue.
- Forum. 81:328-34. Je. '29. Should we obey the prohibition laws? a Socratic dialogue.
- Forum. 82:218-23. O. '29. Fallacies of prohibition. F. Franklin.
- Forum. 83:209-14. Ap. '30. Prohibition ten years after. F. Franklin.
- Harper's Magazine. 154:335-41. F. '27. Bowery under prohibition. S. Graham.
- Harper's Magazine. 160:161-9. Ja. '30. Lit ladies. M. C. Banning.
- Harper's Magazine. 160:595-602. Ap. '30. Booze and business. J. R. Sprague.
- Harper's Magazine. 161:20-7. Je. '30. Step-Uncle Sam; a Canadian looks across the border. L. Roberts.
- Independent. 116:483-5. Ap. 24, '26. Program for the wets; amend the amendatory clause of the constitution. Henry Hazlitt.
- Independent. 116:683-4. Je. 12, '26. Must Congress enforce an amendment? Reply to Henry Hazlitt. J. Codman.
- Independent. 120:249-50. Mr. 17, '28. Detroit Charons on a modern Styx. F. L. Smith, jr.
- Iron Age. 124:1457. N. 28, '29. To discourage liquor at exhibits.
- Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 24:482-5. Ja. '30. Psychopathology of alcoholism; case studies. W. D. Tait.

- Journal of Criminal Law. 20:102-6. My. '29. Some old-time bootleggers. W. R. Riddell.
- Ladies' Home Journal. 47:3-4. Ja. 8-9. F. '30. Where prohibition is a success. Samuel Crowther.
- Literary Digest. 90:42-6. Jl. 24, '26. America can be bone dry in six month. W. E. Johnson.
- Literary Digest. 91:16-18. D. 18, '26. Ontario's victory for temperance.
- Literary Digest. 91:8-9. D. 25, '26. What we may learn from Ontario.
- Literary Digest. 99:3-5. D. 22, '28. Rum war on the Canadian border.
- Literary Digest. 100:16-17. Ja. 26, '29. Rum-running conference at Ottawa.
- Literary Digest. 101:8-9. Ap. 20, '29. One hundred ninety prohibition killings.
- Literary Digest. 101:10-11. Ap. 27, '29. Wet American ships.
- Literary Digest. 101:24-5. My. 11, '29. Bottle as an arbiter of fashion.
- Literary Digest. 102:5-7. Jl. 6, '29. Rum war on the Detroit front.
- Literary Digest. 102:11. Jl. 6, '29. Wisconsin plan to sell liquor.
- Literary Digest. 102:7. S. 7, '29. Ford and booze won't mix; reply to Henry Ford.
- Literary Digest. 103:16-17. N. 16, '29. Two Canadian drink decisions.
- Literary Digest. 103:21. N. 23, '29. Canada's abandonment of prohibition.
- Literary Digest. 104:13-14. Mr. '29, '30. Canada's peril from bootleggers.
- Literary Digest. 105:7-9. My. 10, '30. Three more states to go dry in the Digest poll.
- Literary Digest. 105:13. My. 10, '30. Truth about Canada's drink plan.
- Literary Digest. 105:8. My. 31, '30. Prohibition control switched; transferring the Prohibition bureau to the Department of Justice.
- Literary Digest. 105:5-7. Je. 7, 30. How the nation sizes up the Digest poll.

- Living Age. 338:430-2. Je. 1, '30. Prohibition as it is; by a New York correspondent.
- Mentor. 18:12-16+. F. '30. Father of prohibition; Neal Dow. A. C. Bartlett.
- Nation. 120:460-2. Ap. 22, '25. Canada turns against prohibition. Richard De Brisay.
- Nation. 127:659. D. 12, '28. Prohibition and citizenship. H. R. Mussey. 128:18. Ja. 2, '29. Discussion.
- Nation. 129:242-4. S. 4, '29. Rum running on the Detroit river. M. Mayo.
- Nation. 130:668. Je. 11, '30. Prohibition flares up.
- New Republic. 58:88-90. Mr. 13, '29. Chicago's booze war. L. Lewis.
- New Republic. 62:265-7. Ap. 23, '30. Liquor control in Ontario; why the former Premier is not an impartial witness. M. Denison.
- New Republic. 63:84-6. Je. 11, '30. Prohibition repeal, practical politics.
- New Statesman. 33:234-6. Je. 1, '29. Fun of drunkenness. Robert Lynd.
- Nineteenth Century and After. 103:756-64. Je. '28. What can we know about prohibition? G. E. G. Catlin.
- North American Review. 228:257-64. S. '29. I know you, Al. E. D. Sullivan.
- North American Review. 228:291-9. S. '29. Shall we scrap the constitution? Reply to C. Nicoll. D. F. Fultz.
- North American Review. 229:257-62. Mr. '30. Death toll of enforcement. J. W. Wadsworth, jr.
- North American Review. 229:648-53. Je. '30. Liquor floods the campus. B. Cunningham.
- North American Review. 230:36-43. Jl. '30. Prohibition's absurdities. H. Hibschan.
- North American Review. 230:124-5. Jl. '30. Begging the issue.
- Outlook and Independent. 139:600. Ap. 22, '25. Canadian experiment; Ontario's new temperance act.
- Outlook and Independent. 143:98-100. My. 19, '26. Canada's experiments in liquor control.
- Outlook and Independent. 144:358-9. N. 17, '26. Principles vs. politics in Ontario.
- Outlook and Independent. 145:358-9. Mr. 23, '27. Ontario's liquor plan.

- Outlook and Independent. 150:843-5. S. 26, '28. Way Quebec looks at it. D. Merritt.
- Outlook and Independent. 150:1026-8. O. 24, '28. Toronto tries control. D. Merritt.
- Outlook and Independent. 150:1191-3. N. 21, '28. Control on Canada's countryside. D. Merritt.
- Outlook and Independent. 150:1309-11. D. 12, '28. Great prohibition mystery. H. O'Higgins.
- Outlook and Independent. 151:424-5. Mr. 13, '29. Look behind the front: the speakeasy. F. L. Smith, jr.
- Outlook and Independent. 152:442-7; 493-7; 527-31; 568-73; 620-5; 660-4; 701-6. 153:21-5. Jl. 17-S. 4, '29. Story of Carrie Nation. Herbert Asbury.
- Outlook and Independent. 153:652-3. D. 25, '29. Dark days for bootleggers. F. P. Dunne, jr.
- Outlook and Independent. 154:124-8. Ja. 22, '30. Prohibition faces facts. F. M. Cockrell.
- Outlook and Independent. 154:288-90. F. 19, '30. On the Chicago front. L. Lewis.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:92-3. My. 21, '30. Sisters of the hollow keg. K. Kennedy.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:203-5+. Je. 11, '30. Those dirty crooks; bootlegger explains his retirement. J. Knowles.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:219. Je. 11, '30. Advice to wets.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:328-31. Jl. 2, '30. Antisaccharites, and others. J. W. Emerson.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:522-6. Ag. 6, '30. Prohibition; born of the war. H. A. Johnston.
- Quarterly Review. 253:247-75. O. '29. New civil war in the United States. I. Phayre.
- Review of Reviews. 77:169-74. F. '28. Prohibition's decline and fall in Canada. C. W. Stokes.
- Review of Reviews. 77:251-8. Mr. '28. Prohibition enforcement, the evil and the remedy. W. G. McAdoo.
- Review of Reviews. 81:82-4. Mr. '30. Prohibition must stay! F. W. Fort.
- Review of Reviews. 81:84-6. Mr. '30. Prohibition must go! J. M. Beck.
- Review of Reviews. 81:51-3. Ap. '30. Prohibition, here and elsewhere.

- Review of Reviews. 81:56-61. Ap. '30. High cost of nullification. H. McLellan.
- Round Table. 19:765-82. S. '29. Progress of prohibition.
- Saturday Evening Post. 201:6-7. O. 20, '28. State dispensary system. R. Crawford.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:6-7+. My. 31; 14-15+. Je 14; 20-1+. Je. 28, '30. First hundred years of prohibition. David Lawrence.
- Saturday Review. 148:290-2. S. 14, '29. What America drinks.
- Scribner's Magazine. 85:204-7. F. '29. Unwritten liquor law. R. R. Harris.
- Scribner's Magazine. 87:153-60. F. '30. What's the matter with prohibition? F. M. Cockrell.
- Scribner's Magazine. 87:630-5. Je. '30. Rising tide of prohibition repeal.
- Scribner's Magazine. 88:45-52. Jl. '30. Benefits of prohibition. Struthers Burt.
- Spectator. 124:26-7. Ap. 24, '30. Prohibition and its effect upon life insurance. J. J. Lentz.
- Survey. 61:682-3. F. 15, '29. Prohibition and prosperity.
- United States Law Review. 63:561-5. N. '29. Duty of the states in respect of prohibition.
- Woman's Journal. 15:5-7+. Je. '30. If not prohibition, what? Ida May Tarbell.
- Woman's Journal. 15:5-7+. Jl. '30. If not prohibition, what? Carrie Chapman Catt.
- World Today. 55:342-9. Mr. '30. Why England will not have prohibition. R. C. Dorr.
- World's Work. 55:614-24. Ap. '28. How long can prohibition last? History shows the first ten years are the hardest. J. H. Clark, jr.
- World's Work. 58:50-4. Mr. '29. Ontario's wet prosperity. C. A. Selden.
- World's Work. 58:41-4. D. '29. How Europe handles the liquor problem. T. R. Ybarra.
- World's Work. 59:61-4. Ja. '30. England going sober. R. C. Dorr.

CHAPTER VI

CENSORSHIP

BATES COLLEGE

RESOLVED: *That legal censorship be abolished.*

This is a report of a debate between two Bates teams on the home platform which took place April 22, 1930. The Affirmative team had won from Williams College at Lewiston and the Negative team from the University of Pennsylvania, both by a decision of two to one, using practically same cases. The question was one used by the Eastern Intercollegiate Debate League in their second series of intercollegiate debates during the season of 1929-1930. Bates College won the championship of the League for the season. This report was secured thru the services of Professor Brooks Quimby, Director of the Bates Interscholastic Debating League.

BRIEF

CENSORSHIP

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION :

- A. Censorship has aroused considerable attention of late.
 - 1. Much confusion of mind exists as to its province.
- B. A censor is defined by the new *Oxford Dictionary* as
 - 1. An official in some countries whose duty it is to inspect all books, journals, dramatic pieces, etc. before publication to make sure they contain nothing immoral, heretical, or offensive to the government.
- C. Censorship is the office, power or action of a censor.
 - 1. It must not be confused with duly constituted legal action.
 - a. Legal action is taken where definite anti-obscenity laws exist under which offenders are brought to court, and, if guilty, duly punished.
 - 2. There are two types of censorship.
 - a. Voluntary censorship.
 - (1) The National Board of Review is an example, instituted by the moving picture industry itself.
 - b. Legal censorship imposed by law.
 - (1) An example is the Ohio Board of Review which was appointed by law to review all pictures before they are shown in the state.
- D. It is legal censorship which the Affirmative would discontinue.
 - 1. It exists in this country now in
 - a. Seven state moving picture laws.
 - b. More than thirty municipal picture laws.

- c. Play censorship in certain cities.
 - d. Certain customs inspection provisions.
 - 2. To do so would correct certain abuses.
 - 3. It would disabuse the American mind from the idea of laying down a regulation to govern an uncommitted act.
 - 4. The evils at which censorship aims can be handled adequately by due process of law.
- I. Censorship is autocratic in principle and therefore dangerous.
- A. It is and always has been an instrument of oppression.
- 1. Sociologists unite in assigning censorship as one important cause of the recent upheaval in Russia.
 - 2. In all history censorship has been the jealously guarded prerogative of the autocrat.
 - a. The more democratic a country is, the less is censorship found in force.
- B. The American people are becoming increasingly aware that it does not fit into our political background.
- 1. Every attempted censorship law since 1921 has failed to pass.
 - 2. In the Massachusetts referendum, censorship was defeated two to one.
 - a. This is the only opportunity the people of the country have had to express their opinion directly on it.
 - 3. It is not a characteristic method in America of controlling the public mind or morals.
- II. Censorship is obstructive to progress.
- A. It dedicates itself to the suppression of radical and non-conformative thought.
- B. The appointment of censors is inevitably involved in politics.
- 1. The result is unjustified suppression of utterances opposing existing political forces.
- C. Censorship is restrictive to genius.
- 1. H. G. Wells says "Censorship with its wanton power is one of the reasons for my never having tried a play."

III. Censorship is unsuccessful in practice.

- A. The magnitude of the task makes necessary the employment of sub-censors to do the work.
 - 1. In one state these are state troupers.
 - 2. They are often incapable of deciding on the matters presented.
- B. There has been no improvement of public morals in states where censorship has been tried.
 - 1. Conditions are no better in New York with censorship laws than in Maine where there are none.

IV. Censorship is a restriction of the rights of the individual.

- A. It is only justified if there are certain distinct advantages to be derived from it.
- B. Censorship has failed to benefit us.
 - 1. It does not prevent the spread of objectionable material.
 - a. States having no censorship laws can show pictures considered objectionable in other states.
 - b. Newspapers circulate freely material that may be censored in moving pictures.
 - c. Censorship of the post office over magazines can be avoided by sending them by express.
 - d. Often books condemned by customs agents may be found in our Congressional library by any one who cares to look for them.
 - 2. It does not raise the morals of the community where it is used.
 - a. In Chicago no scenes of violence can be shown on the screen.
 - (1) Yet Chicago is known only too well for the amount of its crime and violence.
 - b. In Detroit where there is a strict censorship law, the homicide rate is 16.5 per thousand.
 - (1) It is only 4.7 in Los Angeles where there is a very ineffective censorship law, if any.
- V. There is no need for the protection of censorship.
 - A. Some of the material censored does not need it.
 - 1. Why should we ban birth control information?

- a. Practically every other civilized country in the world allows its free circulation.
- 2. Literary masterpieces are often banned along with really objectionable material.
 - a. Nor is distinction made as to the uses to which the books are to be put.
- 3. Material should not be censored just because it is admitted to be harmful to the less educated classes.
 - a. Often they would never read or see the material in question if it were not for the notoriety caused by its censorship.
- B. Producers have discovered that "it pays to be clean."
 - 1. Public opinion on the whole prefers the good and wholesome to the obscene.
 - 2. Many producers submit themselves to a voluntary censorship.
 - a. In the movie field we have the National Board of Review, also many theatre owners cooperating in better film movements.
 - b. For the stage there is the Drama League which recommends the worth while plays to its nationwide membership.
- D. We can resort to legal action if necessary.
 - 1. We have recourse to the courts or anti-obscenity laws.
 - a. This gives a man a fair chance to defend himself as to his intentions.
 - b. If guilty it is a fair way to make the criminal answer for his attempt to lower public morals.
 - 2. It is a much more democratic method and more in keeping with our standards of government than censorship.

NEGATIVE

- I. Voluntary censorship would not be an effective substitute for legal censorship.
 - A. It is the threat of legal censorship back of it that makes voluntary censorship effective.
 - 1. Producers submit their shows to the National Board of Review because they know if they don't they may have to submit them to legal censorship.

- B. Voluntary censorship of the type provided by the Watch and Ward Society of Boston is not to be commended.

II. Legal censorship should be continued.

- A. There is harmful material that needs to be suppressed.
1. Justice Ford of the New York Supreme Court recognizes it when he says
 - a. "All that America holds precious in its social structure is threatened with destruction thru the depraving literature, plays and pictures which have taken possession of the publishing and theatrical fields."
 2. So serious has been the menace that the League of Nations has taken it up.
 - a. Representatives of twenty-six nations have signed an agreement to unite in a world-wide movement to protect our youth from the circulation of obscene material.
- B. It is the right and duty of the government to suppress harmful material of this sort.
1. It has the same right to protect its citizens from mental and spiritual injury that it has to protect them from injuries to their bodies.
 - a. No one objects to the Pure Food Laws.
- C. It is not true that the censorship laws are autocratic and unfair.
1. In all states where such laws exist, except that of Tennessee, the right of appeal to higher courts exists.
 2. No state that has created a censorship board has ever abolished it.
- D. It is no argument against censorship that bad decisions are sometimes made.
1. There are instances where every other of our forms of government have failed.
 2. The few mistakes censorship has made have been no real bar to progress.
 3. On the contrary, it is responsible for much good work in suppressing harmful material, that has gone unnoticed.

- III. Legal censorship is preferable to legal action thru obscenity laws as a method of suppressing harmful material.
- A. Obscenity laws tend to advertise the material that should be suppressed.
1. The publicity the suppressed material receives does harm by telling the people just what it is and how to get it.
 2. Legal censorship works quietly.
 - a. The fact that it is a preview keeps the public from knowing anything about the material in question.
- B. Obscenity laws offer no insurance to the actor or the retailer.
1. A play may be before the public for several weeks before being suppressed.
 - a. Investigations may take weeks, and the play is held up meanwhile until the matter is settled.
 - (1) This means the loss of many hours of work to the actor, innocent or guilty.
 2. Under legal censorship this could be prevented.
 - a. A preview would have assured the producer the play was all right before he put it on.
- C. Under the obscenity laws, the decision is in the hands of a jury.
1. The members thereof are more often than not in-expert people.
 - a. The judgment of an efficient censor is much to be preferred.
- D. Obscenity laws are not a preventative.
1. All their work is done after the harm has been accomplished.
 2. Legal censorship is consistent with our modern methods of prevention.
 - a. In criminology today we try to seek out causes for murder and prevent their recurrence.
 - b. In medical circles, the quarantine is used to prevent spread of disease.
 - c. Likewise, legal censorship seeks to prevent rather than to punish.

- E. Legal censorship is infinitely more certain and definite than legal action thru the obscenity laws.
1. Ernst, in his book, *To the Pure*, admits that censorship is more certain than any other method.
 2. Playwrights in England have admitted the omission of parts from their books that they knew would not pass inspection.

CENSORSHIP

BATES COLLEGE

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

John H. Manning, Bates

We appreciate the privilege which is ours once more to discuss from this same platform with Mr. Weatherbee and Mr. Gould the advisability of continuing the present vicarious practice of censorship. Since the more we study this question the more firmly entrenched become our ideas against censorship, we are not a little surprised that our friends after a trip through more metropolitan areas, are still convinced of the essential right of their stand.

The question of censorship has received considerable attention of late and not a little confusion as to its province has arisen. In fact, we have found it impossible in a previous debate to agree on its meaning. We have been very careful, therefore, in arriving at the full significance of the resolution which we are proposing. Let us pause here to define its terms.

The new Oxford Dictionary defines a censor as an official in some countries whose duty it is to inspect all books, journals, dramatic pieces, etc., before publication to make sure that they contain nothing immoral, heretical, or offensive to the government. To the matter included we add, by agreement, moving pictures. Censorship, then is the office, power, or action of a censor.

Of the two ways now in use for the suppression of objectionable material, one, of course is the use of anti-obscenity statutes. Every state has these laws, and when a charge of obscenity has been demonstrated to the court the offender is duly punished. This is court action and must not be confused with censorship, the second method, the characteristics of which are a preview of everything within a given field by the government.

Of censorship as defined there are two types. One is legal censorship imposed by law. The other is voluntary censorship self-imposed without legal compulsion of any kind.

Now then, let me illustrate the difference between duly constituted legal action, voluntary censorship and legal censorship. When a local newsdealer some two months ago was arrested and subsequently fined in the Municipal Court for the sale of pornographic material, this was the procedure to which we are accustomed following any infraction of law, and was not censorship.

When you attend a local movie you are informed that it has been passed by the National Board of Review. This is the action of a voluntary censorship board instituted by the moving picture industry itself and is not legal censorship.

When, however, the people of Ohio indulge in a cinema it has been passed by the Ohio Board of Review. The action of this body is not voluntary but legal censorship, the Board having been appointed by law to view all pictures before they are shown in the State.

And it is this legal censorship as exemplified in this country by seven state moving picture laws, more than thirty municipal picture laws, play censorship in certain cities, and the customs inspection provisions which we would discontinue, not only to correct present abuses but that the American mind may be forever disabused of the idea of laying down a regulation to govern an uncommitted act.

It is our belief that the evils at which censorship aims may be handled adequately by due process of law and that the guarantees of personal liberty should be retained as they are in our own state.

It has always been the philosophy of this country that there are certain individual rights which should be secured unless denial of them is absolutely necessary. So there is imposed upon the Negative the task of showing that the results obtained by censorship warrant its continuance, for it certainly is a serious invasion of personal liberty.

We indict censorship as autocratic in principle and, therefore, dangerous to democracy. It has always been and is today an instrument of oppression. Sociologists are one in assigning as one important cause of the great upheaval in Russia the oppressive censorship which had been in force.

In Germany, in Italy, in fact in all history, censorship has been the jealously guarded prerogative of the autocrat. The more democratic a country has become, the less censorship we find in force. As Mayor Gaynor once pointed out, "It has hitherto been the understanding in this country that no censorship can be established by law to decide in advance what may or may not be lawfully printed or published. Ours is a government of free speech and a free press. This is the cornerstone of free government."

That the American people have become increasingly aware that it does not fit into our political background has been forcibly demonstrated. Every censorship law attempted since 1921, when war hysteria had passed, has been unsuccessful. In fact, the people of this country have never voted for this measure. The only occasion when opportunity for expression presented itself, in the Massachusetts Referendum, censorship was defeated almost two to one.

In keeping with these results, the *Encyclopædia Britannica* says of censorship, it has not been a characteristic American method of controlling the public mind or morals. The arbitrary nature, moreover, of the whole procedure is revealed by a decision of the Supreme Court of Tennessee that there is no appeal from a censor's decision in that State.

These, then, are some of the evidences upon which we base our charge of high-handedness and autocracy against censorship.

Someone has poetically written, "Who sees the beauty of the lily sees not the dirt on the stem." This statement forces attention upon another weakness in censorship, the assumption that a group of non-representative individuals can, without reference to changing moral standards, and unaware of the individuals for whom a work is intended, predict its effect. Now, obscenity is the evil which censorship seeks to obviate. But it is generally recognized that the effect of a particular work is almost entirely dependent upon the individual who reads it. Obscenity exists only in that individual's mind. How can anyone, therefore, predict whether or not a book will effect obscene associations, in the absence of familiarity with the mind of that reader. We believe this to be an impossibility, and yet it is by the very nature of the system the task imposed upon the censor.

That it is moreover bound to prevent progress, we believe, cannot be denied. It dedicates itself to the suppression of radical and non-conformative thought and so discourages any serious attempt at revolutionary thinking. In England they have play censorship, of which the *Encyclopædia Britannica* writes, "It is one exception to the now vanished tyrannies which sought to regulate opinion in the mediæval world." Ample evidence of its restricting influence is evidenced by the statement, among that of others of H. G. Wells, who says, "Censorship with its wanton power is one of the reasons for my never having tried a play."

Aside from these evils of censorship there are certain others which in practice prove to be an equally inseparable part. One of these is the politics obviously involved in the appointment of censors and the subsequently unjustified suppression of utterances of opposing political forces.

But assuming, however, that reasonable competent head-censors could be secured, their task of viewing fifty-four miles of film in a week makes it necessary to employ sub-censors to do most of the actual work. Fitness of these individuals for their tasks may be inferred from the fact that in one State, state troopers are used as sub-censors.

It is to be expected that such individuals should be guilty of censoring masterpieces such as *Candide*, of eliminating as brutal a moving picture showing a man being hit on the head by a rubber hammer, of hundreds of foolish mistakes and gross inconsistencies.

"Will you drink your hair tonic here or take it home?" was removed as a crime incentive. A news-picture of Villa was not passed because he was a "murderer and a bandit." The following dialogue was eliminated for an equally inane reason. Irrate father: "This hurts me more than it does you."

Martyred boy: "Yes, but not in the same place."

As autocratic, then, as arbitrary, as obstructive to progress, as restrictive to genius, and as unsuccessful in practice, we hold censorship to be an unjustified curtailment of individual liberty. To justify it our friends must show that it is working, that it actually raises moral standards. We ask for evidences of harm done by a picture passed only by the National Board of Review. We urge them to define their stand.

Would they retain legal censorship only for those cases in which it now applies, or would they extend it to all vehicles of

expression? Now, these are practical questions, and until they are answered we join with the American Bible Society, the secretary of which, Dr. William I. Haven, says, "It is not easy to commit to a few people, selected as they must be, the privilege of deciding in advance in these doubtful questions that are generally the subject of censorship. At present we are safer in a great, free republic with carefully prepared laws and the action of the courts, bringing to justice those who violate the law."

FIRST NEGATIVE

Randolph A. Weatherbee, Bates

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I would like to compliment Mr. Manning in his very skillful interpretation of the terms of this evening's question. I think that he has defined the terms with an accuracy and definiteness that proclaims him to have an unusual appreciation of this question. May I suggest that if Mr. Manning has not already chosen his vocation, he might well consider becoming a censor.

We quite readily accept Mr. Manning's definition of censorship and the distinction he has drawn between legal prosecution and censorship. In the case he cited of the Lewiston vendor of pornographic material, legal prosecution—not censorship—was used, as he said. This is a good example of the difference in these methods of suppression. In this Lewiston case—legal prosecution—the offender was punished after the material had reached the public—a case of locking the stable after the horse has been stolen—but in censorship there is a preview—the material is suppressed *before* the harm is done.

Mr. Manning has told you that there are three types of censorship. We quite approve of the voluntary censorship such as the National Board of Review, which has no legal backing. It is very fine, but it is no substitute for legal censorship, for this reason. It is the threat of legal censorship that gives this voluntary plan its value—the producers submit their shows to the National Board of Review because they know that if they don't, they will have to submit them to the more severe legal censorship. Take away the threat of legal censorship as our opponents would do, and voluntary censorship would be powerless to guard against obscenity.

Then there is another type of censorship, exemplified by the Watch and Ward Society of Boston, where voluntary censors look for obscenity on their own accord, and then make use of the obscenity laws to prevent the spread of the material they consider objectionable. We do not approve of this type of censorship. Of course, we are not here to say that the people of Boston shouldn't have the Watch and Ward do their censorship for them if they want to, but we do say that this important power of censorship should be legal—in the hands of the true representatives of the people.

Let me answer now the question of Mr. Manning, as to whether we would extend censorship to all vehicles of expression. We are not advocating this extension—in fact, our duty this evening is to uphold censorship as it exists, for obviously the Affirmative is not arguing the abolition of anything that does not exist. As usual, the burden of proof of this debate rests with the Affirmative. They must advocate the abolition of all existing forms of censorship in this country or they must show you reason for abolishing the movie censorship boards now existing in seven states and some thirty municipalities, of censorship of dangerous materials by the customs officials, and of the government censorship through the Post Office Department.

On the other hand, it is our duty to uphold legal censorship, and while it is not necessary for us to advocate any particular form of censorship machinery, we believe that the States and municipalities that have censorship at the present time and have worked out forms of organizations that have been successful should be allowed to retain them.

The first point that arises is whether there is harmful material that needs to be suppressed. The Affirmative says nothing about the presence of this dangerous material but, Ladies and Gentlemen, they admit its presence and its danger when they advocate due process of law as protection from it. By advocating this means of protection they admit that there is a danger of obscenity and a need for protection. I think that everyone of you will agree that there is a need for protection for haven't you all seen movies that you wouldn't want to take your mother or sister to? Haven't you all seen magazines that you wouldn't take home for your little brother or sister to read? Of course, you all know that there is some dangerous material that should be suppressed. Justice Ford of the New

York Supreme Court recognizes the influence of obscenity toward moral degeneracy, and he says:

All that America holds precious in its social structures is threatened with destruction through the depraving literature, plays, and pictures which have taken possession of the publishing and theatrical fields.

Justice Ford is not alone in this opinion, Ladies and Gentlemen, and we find even such an organization as the League of Nations taking action against the spread of obscenity.

So serious has been the menace of obscenity that the League of Nations has taken the matter up and in the extracts from the Minutes of the Fifth Session in Geneva, the League says:

... that it need not remind the nations of the close and well-known relationship which exists between obscene publications and the traffic in women, but that all those devoting their activity to this question know that obscene publications corrupt young people, making them victims of the traffic.

Representatives of twenty-six nations, including the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany, testified to the close relationship between obscenity and immorality in their respective countries, and signed an agreement to unite in a world-wide campaign to protect the youth by eliminating filth from circulation among children.

When such an organization as the League of Nations becomes appalled by the seriousness of the spread of obscenity and takes official action to protect the youth of the world, you can see that this dangerous material actually threatens the morals of the young and mentally inferior.

Since this harmful material exists, then certainly it is the right and duty of the government to suppress it, for just as the government has the right to protect its citizens from injuries to the body so it also has the right to protect them from injuries to the mind. Of course, we Americans always cling to our rights, but as the judge said to the defendant on a charge of assault and battery who protested that he had the right to swing his arms as much as he wished—"One man's rights end where the other man's nose begins." Our government allows a man practically unlimited freedom in his actions that concern only himself, but when his actions begin to have an effect on others then the government has the right to make sure that they

do not harm others. For example, consider our Pure Food Laws. A man can adulterate his *own* food just as much as he wishes—he can substitute about any harmful element he wishes in place of the nourishing product—but when this food is distributed among other people, society demands that his foods meet the requirements that protect the public.

If the government by the Pure Food Laws has the right to protect the spread of material that is harmful to the body, then should not the government also have the right to prevent the spread of material that is harmful to the mind? Certainly; and the gentlemen of the Affirmative agree to the government's right of protection when they advocate protection through the process of law. They cannot deny the government's right to protect—the only point of dispute, then, must be about the method used.

Mr. Manning argues that the government has not the right to censor, for censorship is autocratic, and deprives the citizen of his liberties. He says it is autocratic because there is no appeal from the decision of the censors, and he cites Tennessee as an example. It is quite true, as he says, that there is no appeal from the censors' decisions in Tennessee, but Tennessee is the exception to this rule—as it is to some other rules. They don't teach evolution in the schools there, either, you remember. However, in every other state that has movie censorship boards, appeals to the state courts are provided for, and in the Pennsylvania State Censorship Board, for example, there is an article that provides for appeal to the Court of Common Pleas. In the Postal and Customs censorship, appeals can be made to the Federal Courts. So you see, the people's rights are amply protected here.

Then, Mr. Manning says that censorship deprives the people of their rights of free speech by its previous restraint. Let us settle this question once and for all by showing you that the Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that this previous restraint is not unconstitutional. In the case of the Mutual Film Company versus Breiting, in the case of the Mutual Film Company versus Hodge, in every single instance where the question of right of the government to exercise previous restraint through censorship was brought before the Supreme Court, the court has decided that the government has this right.

Then Mr. Manning in his final attack on censorship contends that it is working actual harm in the country by the bad deci-

sions of the censors, and that the states, realizing this, have created no new censorship boards since 1921.

Now, it is quite true that no new boards have been created by a state since 1921, but that is not the significant fact, Ladies and Gentlemen—the significant fact is that no state that has created a censorship board has ever abolished it. Many municipalities have their censorship boards which are working very successfully, too—Philadelphia, for example, has a Board of Theatre Control that is functioning with the greatest success. We are not advocating censorship boards for every state, or necessarily for any state that does not have one now. What we do argue is that states having censorship boards which are working successfully should be allowed to retain them, as these states have shown their desire to do by never abolishing a censorship board that they have created.

Mr. Manning's next point was that censorship fails in some cases—that there are some bad decisions. Of course, there are exceptional cases where censorship has failed—but there are instances where every form of our government system has failed. There are some decisions of boards of censorship which do not meet with favor—so, too, there have been some decisions of our Supreme Court that were so unjust that they were later reversed, yet do our opponents advocate abolishing the Supreme Court? Quarantine is a form of censorship which does not succeed in preventing the spread of all disease—but do our friends favor doing away with quarantine? Just because our laws do not prevent all crime, would they have us abolish our entire system of jurisprudence?

Of course with censorship, as with anything else, it is the mistakes that are called to the public eye. No one hears much of the good work the censorship boards do—it is like the case of the editor who rebuked the cub reporter for his news story of a dog biting a man. "No one wants to read of a dog biting a man," said the editor. "That's not interesting—it's not news. But if you can get a story of a man biting a dog, we will print it, because that is news!" It's the same with censorship. No one notices the hundreds of cases where the censors cut films and bar literature that contains deliberate pornography that would be harmful to the public, to the children of the nation,—that's the case of the dog biting the man—it's not news and it does not come to our attention. But once the board acts un-

wisely, once the censors cut out material that isn't quite filthy enough to be barred—then it's the case of the man biting the dog—it's news—it's unusual—and we notice it. The good work is, due to its very quiet, unpublished, nature, unnoticed, but we all seem to remember the exceptional cases when the censors have made mistakes.

But stop and think. In the cases where the boards have made mistakes—where they have barred filthy material that was not quite filthy enough to be barred—just how much have you lost? Has it, as Mr. Manning said, prevented progress? Has the expurgation of a filthy word from a book spoiled the value of the book for you? Have the occasional mild mistakes caused losses that offset the good that censorship does?

Ladies and Gentlemen, we protect the children of the country from harm to their bodies. Should we not also protect them from harm to their minds? American cities have inspectors who keep the filth and disease-spreading garbage out of the streets—but our opponents would take away the inspectors who keep the filth and mental garbage out of our shows. In this city we have a building censorship—a real censorship with preview before construction starts—and no one can build a theatre that threatens the safety of the occupants. You wouldn't send your children to a theatre that the government had not declared properly protected against fire—a theatre that might be the scene of a horrible holocaust—or a theatre in which your children would be forced to breathe foul, disease-bearing air in order to see a show. Then do you not want your children to have protection against materials in the show that are harmful to the mind?

Now, I would like to ask my opponents their stand in regard to two phases of this problem. First, the matter of the treaties which, as my opponents probably know, the United States has with all the other important nations, agreeing to a form of world-wide postal censorship. Would my opponents have us withdraw these pledges? And do they realize the confusion which would result when this nation withdraws from the carefully prepared net work of postal censorship?

And if our opponents would have us abolish postal censorship in this country—as they must, of course, advocate—how would they handle the matter of harmful material which is sent through the mails? If they should ever chance to find that this material is being sent, would not the harm already have been done?

Doesn't my opponent agree with me that it is much more effective to examine and censor this material as it is being sent, and to prevent the harm being done?

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Howard E. Thomas, Bates

It is interesting to note, after each side has had an opportunity to open its case, that we find ourselves on a common basis on quite a number of points. Each of us has formulated practically the same definition for censorship as opposed to prosecution under obscenity laws. We of the Affirmative agree with the Negative that obscenity does exist to some extent. But they agree with us that the punitive laws now in existence in every state are beneficial, and that the National Board of Review for motion pictures is beneficial. So far all has been harmony. But there is one point upon which we absolutely disagree—the advisability of censorship. It is our contention that the benefit, if there is any, obtained from censorship, does not warrant the putting of such a restriction upon personal liberty. The Negative admit that it is a restriction, but they say, "Look here. We have our pure food laws and our quarantine laws. Why shouldn't we have censorship laws which are so like them?"

But they have overlooked several important differences in their comparison. As yet there has been found no other way which will protect people from impure, dangerous food than by pure food laws; as yet there has been found no other way to prevent the spread of contagious disease than by quarantine. But can the same be said of censorship laws? No! The protection from obscene material, and the prevention of its spread is taken care of by the obscenity laws just as well without censorship laws. They would be only an added restriction with no justification. And another difference is that the pure food and quarantine laws are working successfully. Pure food laws do protect the health of the people; quarantine laws do prevent the spread of disease. We have only to compare our country with several others who do not have these laws, to prove this. But censorship laws are not working. Censorship laws do not protect the morals of the people nor prevent the spread of obscenity.

Compare a state with censorship laws, like New York, to one without, like Maine, and you will find that surely there is no improvement because of censorship.

My colleague has already pointed out to you why we object to the principle of censorship; how censorship sets up a sort of tyranny and prevents progress. But not only do we object to censorship as it exists today but we think that since the principle of censorship has extended so far that recently a bill was introduced into Congress to provide a federal censorship for all radio communications, it is time to destroy this principle and have it removed from our system of government forever.

Censorship is a restriction of the rights of the individual. That, the Negative have already admitted. Of course, the government has the right to restrict personal liberty but only if it can show there are certain, distinct advantages to be derived by such restriction. But in order to justify censorship it must be shown that censorship performs duties, that it prevents the spread of objectionable material and that it raises the standards of communities where it is used. This cannot be done. First, I should like to show you how censorship does not prevent the spread of objectionable material. It is impossible for it to do so. The only censorship of the movies is in eight states and a few municipalities. But all the good that might be obtained from such censorship is destroyed because states which have no movie censorship can show the pictures which are considered objectionable in other states, and the newspapers circulate freely any material that may be censored in the moving pictures. The censorship of the post office over magazines: the good that might be obtained from that is destroyed because such material circulates freely by express and there is no censorship there. The good that might be obtained from the customs officials censoring books and articles coming into the country is not to be considered because it is a well-known fact that even those very books which are condemned by the customs officials may be found in the Congressional Library of the United States by anyone who cares to go and look for them.

It is up to the Negative to show instances where the spread of objectionable material has been prevented by censorship. Until they can do this they cannot win their case.

Not only does censorship fail in this purpose of preventing the spread of objectionable material but it does not raise the

morals of communities where it is used. The city of Chicago, working on the theory that movies showing scenes of violence sometimes incite children to crime, twelve years ago put on a strict censorship law. Now, in Chicago, no scenes of violence can be shown upon the screen, not even a revolver is permitted; but you can see how Chicago has benefited by this censorship. The homicide rate in that city is 15.8 per thousand. In Detroit, there is a strict censorship law, but the homicide rate is 16.5 per thousand; but it is only 4.7 in Los Angeles, the most picture-minded city in the world, where there is a very ineffective censorship law, if any.

Of course, this field of movie censorship is only a very small field, and the homicide rate is a very limited gauge of public standards; but it is not up to us to prove that censorship lowers the public standards. Censorship is a restriction of personal liberty and in order to justify it its advocates must give instances where censorship of the movies raises the public standards. You will recall that my colleague asked the preceding speaker a question along this line and he has been unable to answer it so far.

But it is claimed we should have censorship for the little protection it does give, but I can show you that there is no necessity for this protection of censorship over obscene material.

For, in the first place, some of the material that is censored does not need to be. Practically every other civilized country in the world allows the free circulation of birth control information; why should we ban it? And then there is the case of some material which may seem objectionable to the censors but which, in reality, are masterpieces. We have the word of Secretary of the Treasury Mellon and the Assistant Secretary who say that the customs officials, when they ban any book or article coming into the country, take no thought as to whether it is a piece of good literature written by a well-known man, but if it seems obscene to them they ban it along with any other objectionable material that may be coming in. Neither do they make any distinction as to whether a certain book is going to the medical profession or is for the use of the general public, thus hindering the activities of our leading doctors.

Then there is the class of material which should not be censored because it is admittedly harmful to the less educated classes of people; but would these less educated classes read

a questionable book like "Candide" or see a questionable play if it were not for the notoriety furnished by censorship? Everybody, you say, goes to the movies but my colleague has already asked the Negative to give instances where a person has been harmed by anything he has seen in the movies and so far they have been unwilling to answer or unable to.

Another reason why we do not need censorship is because the producers have discovered after years of experience that, in the words of one Philadelphia owner, "It pays to be clean." And this is true because of the fact that the high standard of public opinion of the United States is such that the good and wholesome are invariably preferred to the bad and obscene. This statement may surprise you but it can easily be proved. I have here a list of the ten best money-makers of a year in moving pictures, and do you think this list contains such titles as "Paris Bound" or "Partners in Crime"? In the list are the following, "The Thundering Herd," "The Covered Wagon," "The Freshmen," "Abraham Lincoln," "Sally," and "Riders of the Purple Sage." And not one bit of obscenity in any of these.

If the people of the United States were unable to judge for themselves what is good and what is bad, there would be some sense in having this restriction placed upon them; but if they are able to judge for themselves, is it not better to let them do so?

And another reason why censorship is not necessary today is the fact that many producers submit themselves to a sort of voluntary censorship. In the field of the movies we have the National Board of Review which passes upon 99 per cent of all the dramatic productions in the movies in the United States, and it is doing good work. In this same field, in the movies, in certain cities we have some theatre owners who cooperate with the leading citizens in forming Better Films Movements. These movements take a better form of approach in that they emphasize the good picture while not saying anything about the bad. Along the same line, in the field of the stage, we have the Drama League, which sends to its nation-wide membership a list of all the good productions which have been reviewed, and it says nothing about the bad ones.

But even as a last resource, when there is some material which gets by all of these restrictions, we have the regular processes of trial procedure. When there is material which is

put upon the market only to make money out of the weaknesses of others, when insane or weak minds deliberately force their pornographic literature upon the market, we have recourse to the courts, under the anti-obscenity laws. We would not have these laws used as they are in Boston and other "pure" cities as a threat by the police to prevent a man from selling what may be all right; but we would have them used as they are in Maine and various other states, as a last resource for the protection of our moral standards against filth and pornography.

Here we have the necessary protection and trial procedure is a much better way of protection than censorship. For this process of law does not hold up masterpieces; it does not look at every single word to see if it cannot find something objectionable; it does not set up a board of one or three men to judge beforehand what harm might be done by the publication; and it does not deny to a man his right of trial by jury, but it gives a man a fair chance to show just what was intended in his book, to defend himself when he produces something which is considered objectionable, and then if he is unable to defend himself sufficiently, this procedure is the fair way of making the criminal answer to an outraged public opinion for the attempt to lower its morals. The process of a trial by jury is much more democratic and much more in keeping with our standards of government than is the preview of censors.

This, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the whole case of the Affirmative as it stands this evening. We do not attempt to deny that there is objectionable material today. We would be foolish to attempt to do such a thing. But we do deny that the protection from this material should come in the form of legal previewing censorship. We have various reasons to show why censorship is not necessary. In the first place, the producers have discovered that it pays to be clean because of the high standards of public opinion, and the people are deciding just what is good and what is bad. And as a last recourse we have recourse to the obscenity laws to which we may go, which are a much safer way of dealing with the situation than is censorship.

Censorship is a restriction upon the rights of the individual. The government has a right to make this restriction only on condition that there are some advantages to be derived from them. This is certainly not the case in censorship, for not

only does it fail in its purpose of preventing the spread of objectionable material but it does not raise the moral standards of any community, where it is used.

The Negative, to prove their case this evening, must give instances where censorship has raised the moral standards in certain communities. This, you will remember, is what my colleague asked them at the conclusion of his speech. As to his other question concerning their stand on the extension of censorship, Mr. Weatherbee answers that they favor censorship only where it is working successfully to-day. Surely not a difficult stand to maintain! But just where is censorship working successfully? "Oh," Mr. Weatherbee says, "you never hear about that." But surely after all their research on the question our friends must have found some instances where censorship works. Won't they tell us a few of them?

SECOND NEGATIVE

Samuel Gould, Bates

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I know you will agree with me that this debate as presented by the Affirmative this evening has been a very stirring one. To be perfectly frank, however, what stirred me most was the startling series of admissions which they saw fit to make. You will remember that my colleague, Mr. Weatherbee, pointed out the presence of obscenity. This, the Affirmative admitted. Then he spent a good deal of his time demonstrating to you the need for protection against this obscenity. This too, the Affirmative admitted. Following this, Mr. Weatherbee showed that the government has the right to protect its citizens against this obscenity: And for the third time the Affirmative agreed, since their own idea is nothing more than government protection.

Mr. Thomas, who just took his seat, made another startling admission when he told you that the National Board of Review is quite all right and that he favors it. Of course, the National Board of Review is voluntary censorship, but no doubt, Mr. Thomas is aware that in Florida this same board is made legal. Would he venture to say that the beneficial effects of the National Board of Review have been lessened by the fact that the Board has become legal in Florida? Of course not; it has

been strengthened. H. D. Stecker, prominent movie director, has this to say regarding the National Board of Review: "The machinery created by the industry through Mr. Hays is not a substitute for the efforts which the public is making, and has made to protect itself; it is merely supplementary." So you see that legal censorship is quite necessary even with the National Board of Review, and that Mr. Thomas really thinks quite a bit of legal censorship after all.

In abolishing legal censorship the Affirmative has neglected, quite purposely, to tell you, in spite of our repeated inquiries, that they are abolishing government censorship of the mails. The significance of this cannot be realized until you consider that the United States in a postals agreement treaty at Paris in 1910, and again at Stockholm in 1924, pledged herself with the other nations to do her part in keeping obscenity out of the mails. In abolishing legal censorship she would now have to renounce this pledge, and in renouncing this pledge new treaties would have to be formulated. Think of the results, with the other countries vainly trying to check the stream of pornography that would be pouring through the United States' mails to other countries! It would mean chaos, as far as checking obscenity was concerned. And yet in the fact of all this the Affirmative stand for abolition.

Bearing in mind all these admissions and weaknesses of the Affirmative, what does the debate simmer down to? It is now merely a contest over method. Which is the better method of preventing the spread of obscenity? The Affirmative say, "obscenity laws," while we say, "legal censorship."

In comparing the two methods we can at once get a definite impression of the superiority of legal censorship over obscenity laws alone. Mind you, we do not say that obscenity laws are of no good, but we do say that they are not sufficient. The first great difference is in the way the laws tend to advertise the pornographic material that should be suppressed. The publicity which a trial of this sort receives, while perhaps bringing the offender to justice, does infinitely more harm, by telling the people just what the material was, and perhaps how to get it. Obscenity certainly cannot be checked this way. On the other hand, legal censorship works quietly and does not advertise material. The fact that it is a pre-view means that the material never reaches the public, and is never known to it.

Another thing which makes the obscenity laws insufficient, is the fact that they offer no insurance for the actor or retailer. For example, a play may open, run a few weeks, and then be closed by the police for containing obscene material. An investigation takes place which requires weeks or months before the trial is settled, and during all this time, the poor actors, innocent or guilty, must sit idly by awaiting the decision of the court. Our unemployment situation is certainly bad enough to-day without trying to add to it. A striking example of this is the case of Mae West. This case shows conclusively the lack of effectiveness of obscenity laws. Mae West opened a play and ran it seven months before the police awoke to the fact that it was indecent. Then the show was closed and a trial took place, which after two years of see-sawing about, was finally thrown out because of lack of agreement of the jurors. A significant fact is that the judge in commenting on the case, said that such matters could best be settled by censors and not in the court room. Under legal censorship such a case would have been impossible because the play would have been pre-viewed, and thus the producer would have been certain that it was perfectly proper in every way, before it went before the public.

This trial of Mae West points out another vital factor in the insufficiency of obscenity laws. The judgment is in the hands of the jury—a group of inexpert people. The difficulties which we have with the jury is known to all. I need not go into it to make myself clear. You can all see how much better the expert, efficient censor is.

The final proof that obscenity laws are not enough is that they are not preventive in any way; they are merely a punishment. All their work is done after the harm has been accomplished. It is simply a case of locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. In order to prevent the spread of obscenity it is of course necessary to keep the material from the public, yet all the laws do is to punish after the material has been spread. Such a method cannot receive credit as being sufficient in itself. Legal censorship, on the other hand, is consistent with all our modern methods of prevention. Today we are attacking problems with a different view-point than we did in the past. In criminology, for example, the problem today, is not merely to punish the criminal, but is to seek out causes for murder, and to try to prevent their recurrence. In medical circles we quaran-

tine, another method of prevention. And so in like manner legal censorship seeks to prevent rather than to punish. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of punishment.

We claim also for legal censorship that it is infinitely more certain and more definite. It is something with a real threat behind it. Ernst, a most rabid opponent of censorship, in his book, *To the Pure*, admits that censorship is more certain than any other method. And playwrights in England have admitted that they did not dare add portions to their books because they knew they would never pass inspection. The threat of censorship is one against pornography and filth and does not lose for us any real art.

Now the burden of proof has been on the Affirmative this evening. Let us see, just what they have accomplished. To begin with, Mr. Manning in the opening speech of the evening said that legal censorship was autocratic in principle, that it struck at the roots of democracy, yet Mr. Weatherbee has already pointed out to him that there is an appeal from the decision of the censor, and that therefore, there is just as much check on the government here as in anything else. Mr. Manning said also that we would be in danger of having politically appointed censors, but he could not show you why we need have any more politically appointed officials in this line of work than we need have in any other. He told you that the system was unpracticable, that a board of censors would have fifty-four miles of movie film to look over in one week, something which he considers impossible. But is it really so impossible? Figuring the matter out mathematically we find that it would take a board of six censors a week to do this amount of work, working only three hours a day. So much for Mr. Manning.

Coming now to Mr. Thomas, we find that his major issue is that legal censorship is unnecessary. While he is conspicuously silent concerning mistakes which are made in our law courts today, he insists in saying that legal censors make many foolish mistakes. There are just two kinds of mistakes that they can make. One kind concerns border line cases where there may be a bit of doubt as to whether or not the material is obscene. In such cases does it appear to you that anything is lost by keeping back this material? Do we have to have all the stark, sordid realism dragged under our noses constantly to know that it is there? And then as to important mistakes Mr. Thomas has

given you no proof to show that there have been such mistakes. We are not here to discuss trivial things. We are here to say that a legal board is necessary to suppress such deliberate pornographic material as is now circulating with the obscenity laws in practice. To impress this upon you let me quote from a catalog advertising a book called "Green Girls":

Hardly a single work has ever been published which contains the depth of girlish lust described in this book. The effect is quick and certain and we strongly advise any man before he begins to read to have a pretty young girl within easy reach, for he will require her delicate touches before he has perused many pages.

It would be impossible to find a story better adapted to seduce the mind of an innocent and pure girl, and to arouse the virgin pleasures in the coldest beauty.

This is the type of filth that circulates and spreads today, yet Mr. Thomas tells you that the obscenity laws are sufficient in themselves.

And now, he continues by saying that legal censorship does not prevent the spread of objectionable material. He tells you that Chicago with legal censorship has much more vice and crime than cities without the system, forgetting, of course, all the other factors, such as poverty and poor home conditions which enter into the case, thus making accurate figures unavailable. He challenges us to show that Chicago with legal censorship is any better off than Maine without it. That is not the question, Ladies and Gentlemen. The question is whether Chicago would be worse off without legal censorship than it is with it, and that we believe to be the case.

As a final challenge, Mr. Thomas asks us to show where legal censorship is working successfully. Surely, he is familiar with the system in Philadelphia, where the censors are working in complete harmony with the people and producers, where they are working quietly and efficiently, and where they are daily earning the respect and admiration of other cities. We submit to him that the legal play censorship situation in Philadelphia is an ideal one.

In a final estimate of the two cases, now, I have contrasted for you the two methods, obscenity laws versus legal censorship. I have pointed out to you the insufficiency of the obscenity laws. Legal censorship as a preventative rather than as punishment is

the only step already working successfully and proving itself sound. Its definiteness is admitted by its opponents; its faults are trivial, as shown by the failure of the affirmative arguments to withstand inspection. I can appeal only to the good sense of you, the American people, when you send your little boy to the theatre you do not wait to pull his maimed and shattered body out of the wreck of the building before providing a board to make sure that building shall be safe. What good is punishment of the offender after your little boy's life has been lost? When scarlet fever rages, you do not wait to catch it and then have it cured. You isolate those who have it and prevent it from spreading. You keep harmful plants out of your country, you keep harmful foods out of your body. Both are preventive methods. And so in like manner we ask you to keep harmful material out of your minds and those of your children by preventive method. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of punishment.

REBUTTAL

John J. Manning, Bates

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We were, needless to say, very interested in the masterly manner in which Mr. Gould proceeded to dispatch the entire Affirmative argument. It is now my pleasure to emulate my friend, and because of time limits, I trust do so even more succinctly.

We are startled by his emphasis upon the fact that the National Board of Review and legal censorship are one and the same thing in Florida. Obviously, then, legal censorship means no more protection for Florida than we enjoy in Maine. Not a single case have the Negative presented to show that legal censorship is an added protection.

Our friends have greatly stressed the importance of prevention rather than punishment. And yet they have not shown that censorship is preventive. They have blandly assumed that a temporal difference marks one method, legal censorship, as preventive; and the other, obscenity statutes; as punitive. In the absence of any proof advanced to the contrary we believe the obscenity statutes are far more of a preventive than censorship has thus far proved to be. This is the vital weakness

in the stand of our friends. They have assumed, without proof that censorship is actually effective, that it accomplishes what it set out to do. Yet we have shown that because of its inherent weaknesses, because of faulty administration, incompetent censors and general unpopularity it can never work.

Mr. Gould has referred to the advertising effect of obscenity laws. Yet, I ask you, what single thing enhances the selling power of a book more than the fact that it has been censored. How did *Green Girls* to which he referred, gain currency where legal censorship is supposed to be operative?

They have not explained the strange ruling by which all of the material excluded by the customs censors is present in the Congressional Library.

The Negative case has been divided into three parts—the need of protection, the right of the government to protect, and the advantages of legal censorship over obscenity laws. We have not denied the need of protection. We have shown, however, that this need can be met by the National Board of Review, by other voluntary organizations, by the intelligent self-interest of producers and theatre managers, and finally by the customary use of the anti-obscenity laws.

We admit the right of the government to protect its citizens, but we seriously question the justice of such a serious infringement of personal liberty, when it is proved entirely unnecessary.

Finally, in conditions in our own State as compared with those in the seven which have legal censorship we have ample evidence as to the success of the two methods.

Certain weaknesses and omissions in the Negative stand may well be reëmphasized. They have admitted that they would retain legal censorship only for those cases, in which it now applies. Then they can not consistently make all these claims for its effectiveness, because it is only operative in seven of the states.

They have not disproved that censorship is a considerable invasion of personal liberty. In fact, they could not, very well, in view of the stands of the jurists, Kent, Storey, and even the Supreme Court. But they have not been able to justify it. They have not shown that the people of Ohio are better for censorship, that the people of Maine are worse for not having it, that the youth of Chicago is protected more than the youth of Lewiston.

You must choose, then, between legal censorship and due process of law. Which do you prefer—legal censorship, a system which is a far greater personal restriction than any of our laws, which must leave so much undone or become so autocratic as to be intolerable, which is unpopular, arbitrary, and unnecessary, which is not working and which is characterized by even the *Encyclopædia Britannica* as an un-American method of procedure?

Or do you prefer protection by anti-obscenity statutes, the procedure used in Maine, the one generally in use for assuring socially acceptable conduct, without previous restraint, which provides for appeal, which is working in forty-one of the states in this country, and which effectively protects our youth?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CENSORSHIP

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Libraries. 34:445. N. '29. Bibliography on censorship. Margery Bedinger.
- Young, Kimball and Lawrence, R. D. Bibliography on censorship and propaganda. (Publication. Journalism series. vol. I. no. 1) 133p. \$1.25. Univ. of Oregon. Eugene. '28.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Canadian Council on Child Welfare. Motion pictures children will like, 1927-1928. (Publications. no. 24) The Council. Ottawa.
- Chase, W. S. Case for the federal supervision of motion pictures. 36p. pa. International reform federation. 206 Pennsylvania Ave. S. E. Wash. D.C. '27.
- Chase, W. S. International film situation. 12p. pa. Federal motion picture council in America, inc. 481 Bedford Ave. Brooklyn. '27.
- Chase, W. S. Is the trend of motion pictures upward? 15p. pa. International reform federation. 206 Pennsylvania Ave. S. E. Wash. D.C. '27.
- Children, the Parents' Magazine. What motion pictures for children? 12p. pa. gratis. 255 4th Ave. N.Y. '28.
- Clark, B. H. Œdipus or Pollyanna; with a note on dramatic censorship. (Univ. of Washington Chapbooks. no. 4) 7-37p. pa. 65c. Univ. of Washington Bookstore. Seattle. '27.
- Dennett, M. W. Who's obscene? xi-xiii, 281p. \$2.50. Vanguard Press. N.Y. '30.
- Ernst, M. L. and Lorentz, P. Censored; the private life of the movie. xvi, 199p. \$3.50. Cape and Smith. N.Y. '30.
- Ernst, M. L. and Seagle, William. To the pure: a study of obscenity and the censor. 336p. \$3. Viking Press. N.Y. '28.

- Ford, John. Criminal obscenity, a plea for its suppression. 143p. \$1.50. F. H. Revell. N.Y. '26.
- Graves, W. B., ed. Readings in public opinion. xxxiv, 1281p. \$6. D. Appleton. N.Y. '28.
- Kallen, H. M., ed. Freedom in the modern world; lectures delivered at the New School for Social Research by W. H. Hamilton and others. xii, 304p. \$2.50. Coward-McCann. N.Y. '28.
- Kallen, H. M. Indecency and the seven arts. xv, 246p. \$2.50. Horace Liveright. (formerly Boni and Liveright) N.Y. '30.
- Lawrence, D. H. Pornography and obscenity. 40p. \$1. Knopf. N.Y. '30.
- League of Nations. Advisory commission for the protection and welfare of children and young people. Child welfare committee. Cinema. 31p. pa. 25c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- League of Nations. Advisory commission for the protection and welfare of children and young people. Child welfare committee. Cinema. (Publications. 1928. vol. IV. no. 21) 34p. 30c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. D. 10, '28.
- League of Nations. Advisory commission for the protection and welfare of children and young people. Child welfare committee. Report on the cinematograph question. 13p. pa. 10c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- League of Nations. Advisory commission for the protection and welfare of children and young people. Traffic in women and children committee. Suppression of the circulation of and traffic in obscene publications. 8p. pa. 10c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- McAlpin, E. A. Old and new books as life teachers. xviii, 197p. \$2. Doubleday, Doran. Garden City, N.Y. '28.
- Mitchell, A. M. Children and movies. xxiv, 181p. \$2. Univ. of Chicago Press. '29.
- National Board of Review of Motion Pictures. Better films national council. Resolution opposing legal censorship of motion pictures. pa. The Board. N.Y. '25.
- New York State. Department of education. Annual report, 1926-1927. Vol. I. p. 309-17. Motion picture division. J. Wingate.
- Phelps, E. M. Civil liberty. (Reference Shelf. vol. IV. no. 9) 194p. 90c. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '27.

- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1925-1926. Government restriction of individual liberty. Vol. XII. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '26.
- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1928-1929. Freedom of speech. vol. XV. \$2.25. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '29
- Seldes, George. You can't print that! 465p. \$4. Payson and Clarke. (now Brewer and Warren) N.Y. '29.
- Schroeder, T. A. Obscene literature and constitutional law. 439p. \$6. priv. ptd. The Author. Cos Cob, Conn. '11.
- Stidger, W. LeRoy. High faith of fiction and drama. xii,254p. \$2. Doubleday, Doran. Garden City, N.Y. '28.
- United States. Obscene literature. (United States, 71st Congress, 2d session, document no. 54) A. M. Brown, comp. 22p. 5c. Supt. of Doc. Wash. D.C. '28.
- Wickham, Harvey. Impuritans. vii,11-296p. \$3.50. Dial Press. N.Y. '29.

PERIODICALS

- American Mercury. 11:349-56. Jl. '27. Wowsers tackle the movies. J. R. Quirk.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 128:146-50. N. '26. Social standards and the motion picture. Donald Young.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 128:151-7. N. '26. Relation of the motion picture to changing moral standards. H. B. Stephens.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 128:158-62. N. '26. How the motion picture governs itself. C. C. Pettijohn.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 128:163-74. N. '26. Official censorship legislation. F. H. MacGregor.
- Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 128:175-86. N. '26. Work of the National board of review. W. A. Barrett.
- Atlantic Monthly. 137:388-98. Mr. '26. Sex, art, truth and magazines. Oswald Garrison Villard.
- Atlantic Monthly. 139:748-59. Je. '27. Bounds of decency. Robert Lynd.
- Atlantic Monthly. 145:13-16. Ja. '30. Theory of censorship. W. A. Neilson.

- Atlantic Monthly. 145:17-25. Ja. '20. Practice of censorship. Edward Weeks.
- Bibliotheca Sacra. 87:136-49. Ap. '30. American constitution and liberty. J. M. Lashly.
- Bookman. 70:258-62. N. '29. What is dirt? Robert Herrick.
- Bookman. 70:641-56. F. '30. Chronicle and comment.
- Canadian Forum. 9:436. S. '29. Censorship; Book-Of-the-Month Club and Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front*. R. K. Haas.
- Canadian Forum. 10:68-9. N. '29. Censorship; reply to R. K. Haas. R. MacCallum.
- Century. 113:629-34. Mr. '27. Centurion. John Erskine.
- Child Welfare. 23:473-6. My. '29. Mother looks at the movies. R. M. Walker.
- Child Welfare. 24:71. O. '29. Jurist looks at the movies. Henry Meade.
- Child Welfare. 24:308. F. '30. Ultra-sophisticated children. John Mand.
- China Weekly Review. 50:346. N. 2, '29. Venezuela threatened with civil war; drastic censorship methods of the government. Gerald Martin.
- China Weekly Review. 52:200-1. Ap. 5, '30. Foreign vs. the Chinese movie censorship.
- Christian Century. 47:325. Mr. 12, '30. Will Hays and the Presbyterians.
- Christian Century. 47:580. My. 7, '30. Movie profits and poisoned pictures.
- Commonweal. 12:179-81. Je. 18, '30. Man's right to liberty. F. J. Zwierlein.
- Congressional Digest. 9:41-3. F. '30. State laws relating to obscene literature.
- Congressional Digest. 9:33-57. F. '30. Censorship of foreign books; with pro and con discussion.
- Current Opinion. 56:298-9. Ap. '14. Is censorship useless as a weapon against literary obscenity?
- Edinburgh Review. 250:329-50. O. '29. Liberty and law. J. A. Marriott.
- Education. 47:39-47. S. '26. Education and the moving picture show. H. C. Lehman; P. A. Witty.
- Educational Review. 73:112-16. F. '27. Stamping out the weeds of literature. R. S. Kimball.

- Educational Screen. 8:235-6. O. '29. Film censorship in Britain. R. Bond.
- English Review. 50:212-22. F. '30. This way to the pit. John Shand.
- Fortnightly Review. 97:880-94. My. '12. Censorship. John Pollock.
- Fortnightly Review. 124:348-57. S. '25. Censorship of plays.
- Forum. 53:87-99. Ja. '15. Our prudish censorship. T. A. Schroeder.
- Harper's Magazine. 143:253-4. Jl. '21. Murmurings of a common scold. Burges Johnson.
- Harper's Magazine. 143:391-4. Ag. '21. More murmurings of a common scold. Burges Johnson.
- Harper's Magazine. 159:1-10. Je. '29. Dangers of obedience. H. J. Laski.
- Homiletic Review. 98:62-4. Jl. '29. High cost of liberty; sermon. M. W. Williams.
- Independent. 110:192-3. Mr. '23. Absurdity of censorship. H. B. Liveright.
- Independent. 110:334-5. My. '23. Growth of the censorship idea. G. H. Putnam.
- Independent. 114:160. F. '25. Readers and writers. Ernest Boyd.
- Independent. 115:411-12. O. '25. Fighting filth on Main Street. N. B. Miller.
- Independent. 118:467-8. Ap. 30, '27. When is a book pure? Frank Sibley.
- Journal of Home Economics. 22:578-80. Jl. '30. Movies, ethics and children; with recently adopted code.
- Labour Monthly. 11:433-8. Jl. '29. Role of the censorship. Graham Pollard.
- Libraries. 35:127-35; 182-6. Ap.-My. '30. Censorship and the public library. G. F. Bowerman.
- Library Journal. 54:1024-6. D. 15, '29. Who shall decide what we can't read? liberty of purchase. C. L. Cannon.
- Literary Digest. 77:27-9. Je. 23, '23. Censorship or not.
- Literary Digest. 92:31-2. F. '27. Revolt against revolting.
- Literary Digest. 93:29. Je. '27. Censors and their enemies.
- Literary Digest. 100:24. Ja. 12, '29. English literature paganized.
- Literary Digest. 103:19-20. O. 19, '29. Strange interlude.

- Literary Digest. 103:19. D. 7, '29. Scissoring the films in the east.
- Literary Digest. 103:17. D. 28, '29. Mind your word about movies.
- Literary Digest. 104:13. F. 1, '30. War on the Minnesota gag law.
- Living Age. 308:48-53. Ja. 1, '21. Humors of the dramatic censor.
- London Mercury. 20:608-11. O. '29. Books that we cannot read. Robert Lynd.
- Nation. 85:439. N. '07. Dramatic censorship again.
- Nation. 89:147-8. Ag. '09. Examining the examiner.
- Nation. 111:343. S. 25, '20. Again the literary censor; suppressing of Cabell's *Jurgen*.
- Nation. 114:59-60. Ja. 18, '22. Stage and the censor.
- Nation. 117:678. D. 12, '23. Film censors and other morons.
- Nation. 124:162-3. F. 16, '27. Indecency of censorship. Joseph Wood Krutch.
- Nation. 124:218-20. F. 23, '27. Russian censor relents.
- Nation. 124:713-14. Je. 29, '27. Poor me and pure Boston. Upton Sinclair.
- Nation. 126:286. Mr. 14, '28. Censorship by fear; padlock law.
- Nation. 127:601-2. D. 5, '28. Padlocking the talkies. J. N. Rosenberg.
- Nation. 128:365. Mr. 27, '29. Fumigated movies.
- Nation. 128:389-90. Ap. 3, '29. Censorship wave.
- Nation. 128:497. Ap. 24, '29. What is corruption?
- Nation. 129:767-8. D. 25, '29. Moral pestilence.
- Nation. 130:64-5. Ja. 15, '30. My brother's peeper; New England Watch and Ward society. Gardner Jackson.
- Nation. 130:178. F. 12, '30. Watch and Ward objects; reply to Gardner Jackson. Raymond Calkins.
- Nation. 130:642. Je. 4, '30. Obscenity in court.
- Nation and the Athenaeum. 45:701-3. Ag. 31, '29. Youth and censorship. R. G. Randall.
- Nation and the Athenaeum. 46:508-9. Ja. 11, '30. Mr. D. H. Lawrence and Lord Brentford.
- Nation and the Athenaeum. 47:9-11. Ap. 5, '30. Film censorship. R. G. Randall.
- New Republic. 19:13-15. My. 3, '19. The Debs case and freedom of speech. Ernest Freund.

- New Republic. 26:123-5. Mr. 30, '21. Press censorship by judicial construction.
- New Republic. 27:350-1. Ag. 24, '21. On the advantages of censorship and espionage. C. A. Beard.
- New Republic. 45:350-2. F. 17, '26. Gutter literature. Ernest Mandeville.
- New Republic. 49:344-5. F. 16, '27. Is the censor coming?
- New Republic. 50:5-7. F. 23, '27. Censorship as self-control.
- New Republic. 58:318-20. My. 8, '29. Enemies of society.
- New Republic. 59:64-6. Je. 5, '29. Censoring the talkies. Traverse Clements.
- New Republic. 59:119-21. Je. 19, '29. Arbiters of obscenity in the Post Office department. Duff Gilfond.
- New Republic. 59:141. Je. 26, '29. Nice Nellie, the censor.
- New Republic. 59:206-8. Jl. 10, '29. Refined and lonely people; readers of smut magazines. T. S. Matthews.
- New Statesman. 34:219-20. N. 23, '29. Pornography and the censorship.
- Nineteenth Century and After. 105:433-50. Ap. '29. Censorship of books; symposium.
- Nineteenth Century and After. 106:207-11. Ag. '29. Censorship of books. Viscount Brentford.
- Nineteenth Century and After. 107:378-90. Mr. '30. New Roman index. G. G. Coulton.
- North American Review. 213:346-9. Mr. '21. Censor of art. S. L. M. Barlow.
- North American Review. 216:577-91. N. '22. Decency in literature. John Erskine.
- North American Review. 227:737-43. Je. '29. Free speech for talkies? E. W. Hullinger.
- North American Review. 229:518-25. My. '30. Banned in Boston. R. T. Bushnell.
- Outlook and Independent. 149:6-7. My. 2, '28. Natural censorship. H. O'Higgins.
- Outlook and Independent. 149:214-16. Je. 6, '28. Boston's bogymen. H. H. Smith.
- Outlook and Independent. 149:733-4. S. 5, '28. On censorship. J. N. Rosenberg.
- Outlook and Independent. 151:378-9. Mr. 6, '29. Free advertising.

- Outlook and Independent. 151:536. Ap. 3, '29. Sense in censorship.
- Outlook and Independent. 153:579. D. 11, '29. Social censorship. W. E. Hocking.
- Outlook and Independent. 153:645-7. D. 25, '29. Our lady censors. Creighton Peet.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:3-5. My. 7, '30. Watch dogs and morals; English view of censorship. H. W. Steed.
- Outlook and Independent. 155:214. Je. 11, '30. More of the same; Massachusetts supreme court and Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*.
- Parents' Magazine. 5:11. F. '30. Crisis in the movies. W. B. Pitkin.
- Parents' Magazine. 5:14-16+. F. '30. Should children go to the movies?
- Peabody Journal of Education. 7:281-4. Mr. '30. Censorship of literature. M. F. Modder.
- Philological Quarterly. 9:78-81. Ja. '30. Another renaissance attack on the stage. G. C. Taylor.
- Poetry. 36:150-2. Je. '30. Honor and the United States Senate. Ezra Pound.
- Publishers' Weekly. 117:306-7. Ja. 18, '30. Proposed censorship legislation; text of bill submitted to New York assembly. L. W. Post.
- Publishers' Weekly. 117:983-4. F. 22, '30. Albany hearing on censorship.
- Publishers' Weekly. 117:1339. Mr. 8, '30. Alice in censorland. H. R. Burgess.
- Publishers' Weekly. 117:1670. Mr. 22, '30. New censorship bill passed in Massachusetts.
- Publishers' Weekly. 117:2516-18. My. 17, '30. New York society for the suppression of vice. J. S. Sumner.
- Publishers' Weekly. 117:2734-7. My. 31, '30. Censorship forum.
- Publishers' Weekly. 118:254-5. Jl. 19, '30. Decision threatens ad censorship.
- Quarterly Review. 245:313-30. O. '25. Movies and morals. C. K. Allen.
- Quarterly Review. 253:18-27. Jl. '29. Literary censorship and the law. J. C. Morris.
- Review of Reviews 75:393-8. Ap. '27. Motion pictures and their censors. W. H. Hays.

- Review of Reviews. 75:404-5. Ap. '27. Censor for books?
G. H. Putnam.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:16. S. 21, '29. Censor. Gilbert
Seldes.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:25. Mr. 29, '30. Censorship.
- Saturday Review. 148:601-2. N. 23, '29. Lost opportunity.
- Saturday Review. 149:290. Mr. 8, '30. Letter from Dublin.
- Saturday Review. 149:516. Ap. 26, '30. Mandarins of War-
dour street. David Ockham.
- Saturday Review of Literature. 5:333-4. N. 10, '28. Are all
things pure? Ferris Greenslet.
- Saturday Review of Literature. 6:865. Mr. 29, '20. Minds not
fit for books.
- Saturday Review of Literature. 6:1101-3. Je. 7, '30. Liberty
and democracy. Norman Thomas.
- Scribner's Magazine. 87:355-66. Ap. '30. Comstock stalks.
E. S. Bates.
- Scribner's Magazine. 87:515-17. My. '30. Is censorship possible?
B. R. Redman.
- South Atlantic Quarterly. 28:429-33. O. '29. Movie mentality.
Robert Withington.
- Studies: an Irish Quarterly. 18:431-48. S. '29. Cinema and
the child. J. P. Reardon. Cinema and the adult. C. C.
Martindale.
- Survey. 34:513-16. S. '15. Learned judges and the films. John
Collier.
- Survey. 55:695-6. Mr. 15, '26. Would society be safe if in-
dividuals were free? J. K. Hart.
- Wilson Bulletin. 3:621-6. My. '29. Censorship of books by the
library. Margery Bedinger.

CHAPTER VII

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS ONLY

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

versus

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: *That the privileges of higher education be limited to students of exceptional ability.*

This is a stenographic report of the Freshman debate between representatives of Swarthmore College and New York University which took place in Bond Hall, Swarthmore College on February 14, 1930. The decision by three judges was two to one in favor of the Affirmative. This report of the debate and briefs has been secured for the Annual thru the services of Professor Everett Hunt, Department of English, Swarthmore College, who also supplied the brief for the Affirmative. The brief for the Negative was supplied by Robert Capel, Instructor in Public Speaking, New York University.

BRIEF

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS ONLY

AFFIRMATIVE

- I. Superior students suffer many disadvantages from our present system.
 - A. Inferior students retard progress of classes.
 1. This condition is familiar to all.
 2. This condition is obviously unfavorable.
 3. Solutions are widely sought.
 - B. Inferior students ruin the spirit of colleges.
 1. Earnest students assume an air of indifference.
 - a. This spirit of indifference is dictated by inferior students.
 - (1) They are in majority.
 - (2) They are naturally aggressive.
 - C. The curriculum is injured by the presence of inferior students.
 1. It is adjusted to needs of both inferior and exceptional students.
 - a. It is suited to the best advantage of neither group.
 - (1) Thoroughness is impossible.
 - (2) Exceptional students not fully developed.
 - (3) Inferior students are not capable of much development.
 - D. Rules of conduct are unfavorably influenced by presence of inferior students.
 1. It would be better for exceptional students if they were allowed more freedom.
 2. It would be better for inferior students if rules were more strict.

- E. Many superior students in future will not be attracted to college.
 - 1. Public estimate of the colleges is beginning to fall.
 - a. The "collegiate" ways of inferior students are receiving publicity.
- II. Inferior students suffer many disadvantages from our present system.
 - A. Higher education will never enable the masses to understand modern life.
 - 1. They will always be dependent on experts anyway.
 - B. Colleges now prepare too many for professional positions.
 - 1. Such positions are now open to only 10 per cent of those prepared.
 - a. Higher education involves economic loss to those not getting positions.
 - b. Tax payers and endowment donors also suffer loss.
 - C. A large proportion of inferior students are wasting their time in college.
 - 1. Brown University psychological tests show this.
 - a. The average high school senior made thirteen points below the minimum score for success in college.
 - 2. Dr. Odell's Illinois Survey also shows this.
 - a. It showed that 25 per cent of those preparing for the professions are likely to be dropped from college.
 - 3. Large numbers are dropped at midyear.
 - a. One-third at the University of Wisconsin.
- III. The Affirmative's plan of limitation will greatly improve the college.
 - A. It will allow mediocre students to gain what benefits they can from college education.
 - 1. They would attend junior college for two years.
 - a. Junior college is not higher education.
 - (1) Higher education now considered as beginning with the junior year of college.

- (a) This distinction is recognized in Europe.
 - x. German gymnasium.
 - y. French *lycée* and *université*.
- (b) A similar distinction exists in the United States.
 - w. Stanford and Johns Hopkins are dropping the first two years.
 - x. Princeton is limiting juniors.
 - y. Swarthmore presents honors work in third year.
 - i. Limited to those of special ability.
 - z. Two universities in one at Chicago—a junior and senior university.
- B. This plan will allow exceptional students to develop fully.
 - i. Only those of exceptional ability will be allowed to proceed after the Junior College.
 - a. Junior college will give opportunity to select the exceptional students.

NEGATIVE

- V. Higher education is beneficial and advantageous to the mass of students.
 - A. There are three classes of students in higher education.
 - i. The upper 25 per cent of the students have exceptional ability.
 - 2. The lower 25 per cent of the students are classed as incompetent.
 - 3. The middle 50 per cent of the students are those with average ability.
 - a. This middle group must be provided for in any consideration of the problem.
 - B. The purposes of higher education indicate the benefits derived.
 - i. It is the purpose of higher education today to give everyone an education.

2. It is the purpose of higher education to teach us how to live.
 - a. Higher education can teach us how to treat the body.
 - b. Higher education can teach us how to treat the mind.
 - c. Higher education can teach us how to manage our affairs.
 - d. Higher education can teach us how to bring up a family.
 - e. Higher education can teach us how to be a good citizen.
 - f. Higher education can teach us how to live completely.
 3. It is the purpose of higher education to help those of average ability to take full advantage of the situation in which they find themselves.
 - a. The student is enabled to become master of of the situation and not be mastered by it.
 4. Mathew Arnold says: "The purpose of education is to teach the individual to know himself and the world, to acquaint himself with the best that has been thought and said in the world."
 - a. The real purpose of even Greek and Latin is to teach people to adapt themselves to their environment.
- C. Higher education fulfills the purposes of education.
1. Higher education teaches the individual to acclimate himself towards life.
 2. Higher education teaches the individual to strive to raise his standards of living.
- II. Higher education will benefit society.
- A. The great people of the country realize this and contribute towards its support.
1. Henry Ford said he would give the rest of his life and \$100,000,000 to education.
 2. E. R. Johnson gave \$2,000,000 to the University of Pennsylvania.
- B. A highly intelligent class will be of great help to society.

1. It will be able to take care of governmental, political and social work.
 2. It will raise the standard of living.
 - a. Men will receive higher wages and spend more money.
 - (1) The "coolies" in China are the result of a low-paid class.
 3. Successful business needs college trained men.
 - a. They build the personnel and make the productive units work together.
 4. It counteracts the evils of limitation.
 - a. Limitation does not take care of the large class of average students.
 - (1) They are the middle 50 per cent of the present college students.
 - b. Limitation creates a highly intellectual class and an intellectual class and an unintelligent group.
 - C. It helps the student to raise himself economically and culturally, thereby benefitting society.
 1. It enables him to get a larger financial return.
 2. It raises the economic standard of the individual and of our country.
 3. It teaches him the finer things of life.
- III. The Negative's plan will greatly remedy the existing evils.
- A. An extensive building plan will do away with overcrowded conditions.
 1. It is practical.
 - a. Business firms expand to meet greater demands.
 - b. Expansion is used to settle traffic difficulties.
 - c. John D. Rockefeller has helped the University of Chicago expand.
 - (1) It is now one of our leading universities.
 - d. The World Almanac of 1930 says that \$1,000,000,000 was given in endowments to colleges.
 - (1) This money was given to further building programs in 1929-30.
 - e. Henry Ford intends to spend \$100,000,000 for education.
 - f. Duke University received \$40,000,000 with which to expand.

- B. Segregation will take care of both classes of students.
 - 1. The exceptional students will be given the opportunity to expand to their full capacities.
 - a. They will be put in separate classes.
 - (1) These classes will receive different curricula.
 - 2. The students of average ability will be allowed to continue their education.
 - a. Their status will not be changed.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR EXCEP- TIONAL STUDENTS ONLY

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

versus

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

CHAIRMAN

Mr. William Poole

Folks, I believe we are assembled here tonight to listen to a Freshmen debate between the members of New York University and Swarthmore College. Just about two nights ago—Wednesday, to be exact—I had the privilege of meeting with several other New York University men, at a track meet in Philadelphia, and that proved to be a very interesting competition and I am forced to admit that Swarthmore came out rather much on the short end of things and regardless of what the outcome is tonight, I am sure that the members of the Swarthmore debating team and the members of the Swarthmore administration welcome the members of the New York University here at Swarthmore tonight. I am sure that the subject promises to give us a very interesting discussion.

Tonight we are going to discuss the subject, Resolved, that the privilege of higher education be limited to students of special ability. On this question the Swarthmore College Freshmen will take the affirmative and New York University Freshmen the negative. The speeches will be seven minutes, with rebuttals of three minutes. The judges are Mr. Franklin Folsom, Mr. Shero and Mrs. Eileen Galloway, of the Swarthmore College Faculty. The speakers will speak seven minutes and be allowed three minutes for rebuttal, and it gives me great pleasure to introduce the first speaker on the Affirmative, Mr. Wilson, of Swarthmore.

Lawrence Wilson, Swarthmore

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As has been announced by the Chairman, we are here tonight to discuss the proposition of limiting higher education to those of exceptional ability, to those who can profit best by it. The other people in college, the people not of exceptional ability, are always those who are holding back classes. The conditions in classes in college are familiar to most of us because I can see that we are most of us college people. This condition is always prevalent in any of the classes that I have ever attended. You always come across a certain group of students that are holding back those that are more brilliant. This is a situation that doubtless is not favorable. Any one can see that, and we all know that we would like to get around that and that many efforts are being made to get around that. The members of our team expect to show you how we would propose to get around there. There also is the fact that the element in college that is less brilliant, has an effect upon the spirit of the college. You will find in colleges that there are many students—thank heavens—who are really sincerely in earnest. You will find that these students will go around with a sort of a pretense of not being so, they will try to cover up the fact that they are trying to improve themselves. Now, why are they doing that? It is because they find that the spirit of the college is not in their favor; they find that the spirit of the college is dominated by the person who is not in earnest; they find that these people have so influenced the attitude of the whole college, that the people that are really in earnest are really in a minority, and they try to disguise the fact because they can't be proud of it with such an overwhelming majority on the other side.

Then we find in the modern college as it exists today the curriculum is adapted to the needs, naturally, of all who are there, it cannot be adapted to the needs of the less brilliant students for it must also be adapted to the needs of the brilliant students; likewise, the brilliant student cannot receive all the consideration. The result is this: you will find that the curricula do not admit of thoroughness; you will find, therefore, that your best students are not allowed to get as much education as they

are capable of getting. For this reason, you will find that your curriculum is not the best it could be. If it were of such a sort as to permit all of the students to get the best to their advantage, you will find that the best students do not get what they should get and the inferior students naturally don't get what they could get because in the modern college of today, the best student is held back by the inferior student, the best cannot be brought out of him and the result is that he remains far from being fully developed, whereas, the inferior student could never be fully developed because, in the first place, he is not capable of it.

Also, the rules of conduct are adapted to all who are in the college. You will find that there are many things in which the rules of conduct might be improved; they could be more to the advantage of the good students in being perhaps a bit more lax; they could be more to the advantage of the inferior students by being even more strict. The result is that you will find that having all classes of students in your college is not an advantage; in fact, we proceed to show you this evening that it is not what should be the case. We all recognize that today there is beginning to be a reaction against college. The general opinion of the public now is that college is a great thing, but there is a growing opinion that college has a great many disadvantages. The people that are not well acquainted with college think of college in terms which we are not proud of. They think of the less desirable elements of college, the elements of collegiate socks, collegiate hats, collegiate slickers, collegiate this and collegiate that. You will find now that collegiate life is one thing, whereas college life means another thing. When a man says "collegiate" he means something jazzy. Now that is not caused by the earnest student who spends his hours to the best advantage; that is caused by the student who gives himself plenty of time to be jazzy.

For these reasons, that the curriculum could be more to the advantage of the students who will lead us and the students who should receive the best advantages out of college, if these inferior students were not there; that the rules of conduct could be more to the advantage of the brilliant student; that the inferior students hold back the other students and yet, they themselves are not worth bothering with to the same extent because they are not of the same capabilities. And then, the

fact that the whole reaction against college will be caused by inferior students; and that for that reason in the future, the attitude against college may be such that your colleges will cease to draw the good students; for these reasons, I say, let us limit higher education.

CHAIRMAN—We have just heard the first speech in the Affirmative, in which it was shown that the college curriculum is suited for a half-way group, neither the poor students nor the best students; that it is a poor compromise, and the fact that the rules of conduct hampered some and gave others unnecessary leeway; and now we will hear the other side of the question. I am pleased to introduce the first speaker of the negative, Mr. Wilensky.

FIRST NEGATIVE

Hyman Wilensky, New York

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I wish to take this opportunity of thanking the members of Swarthmore, and you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the audience, who have kindly consented to listen to our debate this evening. We have looked forward with a great deal of interest to this debate, and we hope that when any member of Swarthmore comes to New York University we can return this favor.

The member of the affirmative team has given several reasons and shown how the present curriculum is bad. He has shown several defects in the present curricula. We of the Negative admit that the present curricula is not of the best, but we do not think that the plan that the Affirmative advocates is the one that will completely remedy it. He has considered only two classes, one, a highly intellectual group, and the other, the poor student. We admit that there is a need for a change, but we do not consider that the present college education system requires such a confined limitation as the Affirmative advocates.

We of the Negative recognize three classes: the upper 25 per cent of the students in college—and we consider those of special ability; then, there is a lower 25 per cent, which we consider are those that are incompetent. Then, in between these two groups that together compose only 50 per cent of the college students, there is another 50 per cent that composes the av-

erage class. Therefore, as the Affirmative has advocated only an upper twenty-five and a lower twenty-five, he has completely forgotten that there is a large number of students who compose the average class, and since the plan of the Affirmative is to limit higher education to students of special ability, what is to be done with this 50 per cent in the school that is composed of a majority of the students in college.

We wish to give every one a chance for an education; that is the purpose of our colleges today, to give every one a chance for an education. First, Ladies and Gentlemen, let us consider what the purpose of an education is. The purpose of an education is to teach us how to live and that is the essential question before us. We must know in what way to treat the body, to treat the mind, and in what way to manage our affairs, and a higher education can teach us those things. We must also know in what ways to bring up a family and to behave as a citizen. The purpose of an education is to teach us those things; it is to show us, and to teach us, how to live completely, and this being the needful thing for us to learn, it is, in consequence, the great thing which education has to teach. We must make our life one that is suited to the conditions about us. If we are to give an education to those of average ability, as also to those of especial ability, we are causing that average to be able to take advantage of the conditions with which he is surrounded, he can take advantage of the conditions in life; in other words, he is master of his job, and he is master of the situation in which he finds himself and that situation is not the master of him. He can acclimate himself to life. To quote Matthew Arnold in an address which he delivered to the Eton Literary Society, "The purpose of education is to teach the individual to know himself and the world, to acquaint himself with the best that has been said and thought in the world."

Why do students come to college and take Greek and Latin? The purpose of taking Greek or Latin is not that he should know the rules of grammar, it is not that he can take up a Greek book and be able to translate it, but the purpose of Greek and Latin is to learn how people adapted themselves to an environment which they found themselves in, and to make their life a more harmonious one and a more joyful one. The Ancient Greeks considered life, they thought about it; we don't. The present condition in life is only rush, it is a continual factory

system, we are in a machine age and, therefore, we do not consider life.

The purpose, therefore, of a college education is to teach the individual how to acclimate himself to life; therefore, when he takes these liberal arts courses, when he enters into fields of higher education, he learns these things. What is the purpose of our life today? Are not we, each and every one of us, trying to make our life a more happy one? Therefore, there are lots that enter into fields of higher education so that we can use that education to benefit us and to raise us in the eyes of the world.

Therefore, we of the Negative believe that since there are three classes: those of special ability, those of average ability and those that are incompetent, we believe that the purpose of education is to make one acquainted with life, to be able to take advantage of the conditions in which he finds himself and thus to make life a more happy, a more harmonious one and a more complete one. I thank you.

CHAIRMAN—Mr. Wilensky, of the Negative, has just shown us that there are three classes of students in college, the higher class, the average class and the lower class; has shown us that the purpose of college education is to make possible a more harmonious adjustment with life; and it is now up to the Affirmative to continue the argument, and Mr. Owen of the Affirmative will continue the argument for that side.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Ralph Owen, Swarthmore

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is very interesting to see what my opponents have to say. I am going to try and explain and interpret these facts as they gave them.

As I see it, they said that higher education must teach us how to live completely, how to behave and other things along that line. They want to give the masses higher education and, of course, their argument is that the masses will have more leisure and the more leisure the more education, they have to have something to do with their time. They are forgetting, how-

ever, that the large majority of our people may spend four years in high school and four years more and not know anything about the complexities of our modern civilization. A large majority don't know anything about the tariff, or very little at the most; know nothing about the dispute between the labor and capitalist factions down in South Carolina, and nothing about these problems in industry. For all those things we will always be dependent upon the expert.

Now, every man who goes on to pursue higher education does so with the definite object in mind to train himself for his life's work. Naturally, of course, when I say this I mean men who have trained themselves to such work as the professions, for those higher business executive positions, for engineering or anything of that type. Now, of course, positions of this sort are open to only about 5 to 10 per cent of our people, or rather, that is, only 5 to 10 per cent of the positions in this country are those which those men who have secured higher education only could fill, only that number of specialized trained positions. Practically no one—well, let us say for argument, one man out of a hundred—takes higher education as a form of mental recreation or to acquire intellectual veneer.

This country needs about two hundred thousand physicians, about one million school teachers, and about a hundred and fifty thousand lawyers. Now just think, if we were to train one hundred thousand physicians in the next four years, it would be an economic loss; it would be as bad as destroying a billion dollars worth of goods in the World War, but the economic loss would be insignificant compared to the irreparable loss to these young men. It is foolish to train more men than are necessary to fill up the ranks in the medical profession, or in anything in which there is a limited field. We are, therefore, faced with the fact that only 5 to 10 per cent of all young men and women, at the age of eighteen can hope to pursue higher education to its final goal. Competition is ahead for them who seek to train for these specialized careers, competition of the keenest sort, and I know my opponents will refer to democracy and hold that up before them and believe that democracy should be carried out in a higher education. They are apparently dazzled by this conception, they forget we have left the free-for-all field in which only a few can win; they either do not know it or will not know it, they apparently cannot see the facts. Apparently, they don't

know that in 1924, Brown University, in conjunction with the United States Government, gave psychological examinations to thirty-three hundred Massachusetts high school seniors. These examinations had been given previously by Brown University and they found any student getting a score of less than 46 had no chance whatsoever of succeeding in college; any student getting between 46 and 53 had about one chance, or two chances, out of ten; any student getting between 53 and 80 had an increasingly better chance as his mark increased. But, unfortunately, the Government found when it published this pamphlet that the average, or medium, score was 40, 13 points below any chance of having success in college at all.

A further study showed that 58 per cent of the boys were unfit to go to college and 74 per cent of the girls were either unfit or very poor risks. We might throw them in the impossible class. In other words, our opponents would want, when only two boys out of five and one girl out of four are good risks, for even ordinary college education, they would want them to go on to higher education.

In case they doubt the veracity of my statistics I might refer them to Dr. Odell's Illinois Survey. He tested a hundred and twenty-three thousand Illinois Senior high school students and he found that the facts were just about the same: one-quarter of all the boys who were training for the professions were in a class so low that they too would be impossible risks for any college whatsoever to take.

Now, of course, I realize that this is undemocratic; I know my opponents will not like this undemocratic idea of ours, but nevertheless it is impossible to be more democratic. Take the University of Wisconsin for example. Any student who stays in school long enough to get a high school diploma, may go to the University of Wisconsin, but however, if they admit three thousand students in September, by February the railroads have to give special one-way fares back home because one-third or one thousand of the students are flunked out. They go back, sit on their fathers' doorsteps—or their mothers' as it is—and then their parents are very keenly disappointed at the failures of their sons or daughters in college and besides, there is a needless expenditure of, let us say, five hundred dollars.

Now, Sir, wouldn't you rather have a timely warning and not have your boy or girl go to college and have the disgrace

of having him flunk out and have the stigma on his life forever after?

CHAIRMAN—This debate seems to be getting rather interesting as the speeches proceed. We have just heard that college education is meant for only the groups who are going ahead with professional training and who need the special training to take something advanced and prepare them for a special field in life; while, on the other hand, those who go to college for mere cultural recreation and broadening, well, practically one out of a hundred I believe were the figures quoted of those people who go to college for that purpose. As the debate goes on, perhaps we will hear some more about this question of whether college is for the average student to learn to live a better life, or whether it is only for the people of advanced training and in need of technical knowledge.

It is a very interesting question I am sure, and I am sure we will be glad to hear from the second speaker of the Negative, Mr. Bernstein.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Maurice Bernstein, New York

MR. CHAIRMAN, FRIENDS: My worthy opponents have given you a slighting description of the college student today, the student with collegiate socks and collegiate hats and jazzy ways. That may be the criticism of the public today when they think in terms of college students, but that, perhaps, may be criticism in pity or in jealousy, and yet we have people who come in contact a great deal with the labor problem who say things such as this—you have merely to read from this morning's paper, the *New York Times*, two headlines, one, "Ford to give rest of life to education; says he may spend as much as one hundred million dollars. The Detroit motor car manufacturer said he wanted to do everything he could to help young men to fit themselves for the world." That is one; another: "Eldridge R. Johnson adds sum to foundation fund of \$250,000, to the University of Pennsylvania, which increases to nearly two million dollars the amount which he has given the University during the last ten years."

Here are men that are spending money in order that young men may further their education, therefore, these students are

not so addicted to their collegiate ways as much as they are to their studies. My worthy opponents have also spoken of the poor students who went to the University of Wisconsin and had to take a one-way ticket back home and go to their fathers' doorsteps. I feel sorry for those students, but it is not necessarily the fact that he has not had the ability to carry on in college, but we can place a great deal of blame on the modern curricula of the college, the curriculum perhaps is to blame for his having to go home on a one-way ticket.

My worthy opponents have completely forgotten that middle class that we spoke of as the average student. I will admit to them now that even under our system, permitting the students to come into college, there will be a certain number who should not be there. I admit that, but think of the minor thing that is in comparison to the number of students who will derive so much benefit from going to college, for after all, nothing ventured is nothing gained. It is better to give them the chance than to keep this chance from them and have them hold a grudge against society.

The Affirmative, intending to limit higher education to the student who has ability first creates two classes: we will have in this country a class of highly intellectual individuals and then a low class—if I may say, unintelligent—and between these a gap of 50 per cent of the average students as we call them, completely forgotten, left in chaos.

My worthy opponents have foreseen our arguments of democracy, therefore their views are undemocratic, but we will let that pass for the moment and think of these two classes as they are, namely, if we were to take into consideration these average students we must take into consideration the economic viewpoint to which our country is pledged. Why is our country considered great in comparison to Russia, in comparison to China? When we think of China we think of the poor Chinese coolie working for perhaps a few cents a day, and yet it is because we are paying our men higher wages, that there are then, in turn, more who spend more money and therefore they in turn, as the business cycle goes, help to raise the standards of living in our country. It is things such as these which have helped to make our country what it is.

Also, when we consider business, we consider productive units working together. Each of these productive units consists

of members who are intelligent, who have received the education that can be given them in institutions of higher learning, make these productive units work together, build the personnel and make a success of business; therefore, we shall give success not only to the individual in the fact that we have given him that opportunity to get the education, but we are raising the standards of living, we are raising the economic standpoint of our country and, therefore, benefiting not only society but the individual.

My worthy opponents, in forgetting their class of average students, have brought in as I said before the fact that many of them shouldn't be there. They should be there in that not only are they getting the chance as my worthy colleague has pointed out to you, but they get that added culture, the added opportunity to understand life; yet my worthy opponents bring out the fact that these students hinder those of more intellectual capacities; that is what the third speaker will bring out, a plan whereby we will show it is not necessary for the student of average ability to hinder the student who has more of an intellectual capacity.

In raising the standards of living in our country we also raise the standards in colleges in that when we turn out these men who, in turn, are going to make our economic basis, our society a greater one, we are benefiting them also. What I mean by this is that it is not necessary for us to think of colleges as being high institutions, thinking of the college graduate necessarily because he has a label, that is an A.B. or B.S. degree, but we will think of an intelligent mass of people, a mass of people who after all can take the Government as it was given to us under the Constitution, one which is left to the intelligence of the people. Thomas Jefferson had a great deal of faith in us and, I think, the producers of our country still have faith in us. In order for us to carry these forms of government along, through our representatives, it is true, to whom we give power to institute and legislate our laws, we are giving a mass of people intelligence which they can possess, which they can carry on or which they can leave to their posterity; therefore, I hope I have proven to you that, first, in making these two classes one, a highly intelligent one, rather than one intelligent and one unintelligent one, leaving a gap between into which the average student falls, that by giving an education you are giving the student a chance, that you are raising him economically in the world in

that you are giving him an opportunity to get a better financial basis which, in turn, raises the economic standing of our country; one that will enable the masses to carry on the work, governmental, political and social, of our country also.

CHAIRMAN—This debate seems to be getting to be more and more of a direct conflict between two different conceptions of American development and society; on the one hand, those who advocate the ideals of Thomas Jefferson, on the idea of the masses, an idea of a society based entirely on democracy; on the other hand, those basing their ideals on those of Alexander Hamilton, who stood for something a little bit different, who saw that the thing must be out-doing Europe at her own game in order that America should become a great nation. Alexander Hamilton would have stood for the greater opportunity for the student of exceptional ability, and Thomas Jefferson, on the other hand, would have stood for the equal opportunity for all men to gain education. It seems to be a very interesting historical question, in which we can go back to those two great leaders of our country whose conflicting opinions which are brought together here in this debate tonight. The third speaker on the Affirmative who will continue the argument will be Mr. Kain.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

William Kain, Swarthmore

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Now that both sides have admitted that the present education in college institutions has its faults, and that these faults have been pointed out by the first Negative speaker in regard to those students of exceptional capacity, and by the second Affirmative speaker with regard to those students of less than exceptional capacity, it is now time for us to advance our definite system of improving this in regards to all classes of students.

First of all, before we show that limiting higher education results in a greater benefit to all, we must understand definitely what higher education is. So far it has been taken more or less for granted that higher education and college mean the same thing. All scholars, both in Europe and in America, realize that college and higher education are not synonymous terms. In the

latest Educational Year Book out, published by the Department of Superintendence in 1929, under such scholars as Dr. Charles Judd of the University of Chicago, Dr. Edmundson of the University of Michigan, Dr. Newlin of Columbia University and Dean Withers of New York University, it is shown that secondary education consists of high school and early college; in fact, throughout Europe this distinction is definitely established in that in England the first two years of our college course are included in the public schools; in France in their Lycée, and in Germany, in their Gymnasium. In America also, the higher institutions of education are beginning to realize that the first two years of college are not higher education. For instance, Leland Stanford and Johns Hopkins have definitely in mind a policy of dropping out these first years; Princeton adopts the plan of making the third year, the Junior Year, much harder; Swarthmore admits it by limiting those who take up honors, which begins in the Junior Year. Also, the University of Chicago divides this college work in a Senior and Junior College.

This, then, is our plan: the main difference between the first two years, which are not higher education, which we in our plan bring under the Junior College, and the latter two years, that of higher education, which we hold to be higher education, is that in those latter two years we have more unified and specialized work. Therefore, by our definite plan of dividing work into two groups, Junior College and Senior College, and limiting higher education to those in Senior College, we hold that we would right all those faults which have been pointed out before.

In the Junior College we will admit the average student—which it has been said we have totally neglected; we leave the Junior College open to all for it is not higher education, and in that we will have those humanizing influences, all those college associations which extend our ability and, as Matthew Arnold pointed out, "Let us get the best out of life and adjust ourselves to life as we will find it later." This will be open to all and, as Dean Withers pointed out, the average student is able, in this Junior College, to obtain these great benefits. Also, he shows that the average student, however, is not able to obtain those benefits of higher education; therefore we limit the students in Senior College, higher education, for therefore we benefit those of exceptional capacity for they are not held back from their high standards by those of lesser capacity.

Also, as Dean Wood of Columbia has pointed out, it is a waste of time for those of average capacity—which is this middle 50 per cent class—and those of lower than average capacity to go into higher education for they are not capable of it. Therefore, we save their time and let them get out in life sooner with all the benefits they can obtain which we have given them in the Junior College. They are able to get out with all these growing interests and to meet life at an earlier age and save much time and disappointment. The people of exceptional capacity are able to reach, in these Senior Colleges, that standard which they alone are capable of; they are not held back and therefore their time is not wasted either. Therefore, by limiting higher education, we save time, also we would have an economy which would enable more money to be spent in this Junior College and so would really increase the number that can gain the benefits of college education.

Therefore, we refute that we omit the 50 per cent; in fact, we give those the benefits of a college education; we really give them more opportunities and let them get out into life sooner.

It has also been said that in after life we would have two classes—those educated and those not educated. The fact is we should not, for we would have everybody educated to a higher degree for we would give more people the benefits of a college education, in Junior College, which is not higher education, and we would give those other people who can attain them, these benefits of higher education in specialized work in Senior College.

Thus, by benefiting both groups of students, those of exceptional capacity and those of average capacity, we improve the general standards of living. By dividing college, as it has been shown into secondary and higher education, we will increase the efficiency of college work today and do away with all those evils which have before been mentioned. I thank you.

CHAIRMAN—Mr. Kain, the last speaker for the Affirmative, has now given us a very definite plan presented by the Affirmative for remedying the situation today. I am sure we all look forward with great interest to Mr. Newman, the last speaker of the Negative, who I believe will also give us a definite plan under his argument.

THIRD NEGATIVE

Sanford Newman, New York

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I believe that we should understand just what the purpose of the Affirmative side is. That is, they have to advocate a change from the status quo. They are not doing that; they claim that high school education and their Junior College would be synonymous. Junior College would be merely an extension of a high school education. Now, if that is right, if that is true, then the question is this: should higher education be restricted to students of special ability, and the Junior College would not enter into the question at all because Junior College is merely an extension of high school. The question is, should Senior College be limited to students of special ability or not, because they have said that high school intrudes upon the work of early college, their Junior College is early college work, therefore the high school and the Junior College are closely related, practically the same thing and they are not advocating a change from the status quo.

On the other hand, we have a very definite plan. We have attempted to show this evening that the status quo, that is, the universal education as it is today, has its faults. We admit those; we have attempted to show that it benefits the individual and that it benefits society. We have admitted two faults, namely, that there is an over-crowding, an over-crowded condition, and that the student of special ability is retarded by the student of lesser ability. We admit those faults, but we don't admit the plan of our worthy opponents, we don't believe that their plan of limitation is the proper remedy.

Let us turn to the problem of over-crowding. How do we meet an over-crowded situation any place? Do we cut down or do we expand? To use an analogy, let us take a business firm. Here you have a highly successful business firm. Orders are pouring in, the place has to meet a certain demand. Its supply is limited. Now what does it do; does it go to its best customers and say, "We are sorry, we can't fill your orders." It does nothing of the kind. It is too absurd. What does it do? Builds, expands, takes on a larger personnel, puts a new typist and new stenographer on and so forth. Also take the analogy

of the bridge. Say the bridge is put across the river because traffic should be diverted through that section for some reason, traffic being exceedingly dense at that point. What happens? Do they stop traffic coming through the bridge? It has to go over that bridge for good reasons. What do they do? They don't say to some cars, "You can't come through, traffic is too heavy"; no, what they probably will do is put up a new bridge in some other part. And that is exactly what we contend, that we should expand, build, enlarge our present-day system so as to do away with an over-crowded condition.

Now, we believe that this building program is practical and that it can be done. We have heard, for example, reference to the University of Chicago; John D. Rockefeller and his check-book are synonymous with the University of Chicago. Every time the University of Chicago is cramped, has a lack of facilities and wishes to expand it turns to John D. and he calmly writes out the check and expands the University of Chicago, and today the University of Chicago is one of our leading universities. We point to the fact that the present-day situation is not tending in any different direction, that there is the same tendency. The World Almanac of 1930 shows one billion, one hundred million dollars was given in endowment to colleges to further building programs in 1929-1930. Already we have quoted that Mr. Ford intends to spend at least one hundred million dollars on education. We also include the fact that forty million dollars was given to Duke University of North Carolina and the Chancellor of State said, "We intend to use this to expand Duke to one of our largest universities in the South."

Now we turn to the question of the student of exceptional ability being retarded by the student of lesser ability. We admit that the student of greater ability is retarded; however, we advocate a plan whereby the student of special ability will not be retarded and whereby the student of average ability will receive his just due. We advocate a plan of segregation. We have a precedent for this plan in an article given in *Current History*, written by N. E. Brennan, in the January, 1929 edition. The gist of the theme is this, that after a given period of time in any class, certain students will be singled out because, after all, special ability is a quality, a quality that allows certain students to excel in some line or lines of endeavor. Now, after a certain period of time, by test or some other means, which this debate

does not hinge upon, we believe that the professor in charge, that the instructor in charge, can determine who is a student of special ability in his class, who excels. Now, in a given section, we will say there are about seven classes, and in every one a certain number of students of special ability will be taken and segregated into another class.

Now, we have on one hand a class composed only of students of special ability. What is the result? They receive a different curricula entirely, they are allowed to expand to their full capacity, to absorb as much knowledge as they possibly can, as far as their intelligence will allow them, they are not held back by students of lesser ability, because they are all of the same degree of intelligence, they are all students of special ability.

On the other hand, the student of average ability will not be forgotten; he will be allowed to continue his college education and we believe that a college education will be a benefit both to the individual, to society and to industry at large, and we believe that higher education is something beyond secondary schools, not high school. If high school steps into college, and that Junior College is high school, we believe it is something beyond secondary school because it naturally follows it would be those technical schools and vocational schools which teach mechanics of any kind, are giving you higher education because it is something above the secondary schools.

And in conclusion, let me say that we believe we have advocated a remedy to the two faults which we admit: over-crowding and retardation of special ability progress. We believe our plan allows the student of special ability to expand to his full capability; we believe we also take care of students of average ability who, under their plan, will be forgotten and not be allowed to grasp their full opportunities and to enjoy life. We therefore contend that higher education should not be limited to students of special ability.

CHAIRMAN—Friends, that concludes the constructive arguments on both the affirmative and negative sides; and now we will have a chance to see how successful the two teams are in knocking down the arguments of their opponents.

In these rebuttals, which will be of three minutes in length, the Negative will have first chance. Mr. Wilensky will give the first rebuttal for the Negative.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Hyman Wilensky, New York

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As first rebuttal speaker of the Negative, it is my duty to give a complete summary of our case as it stands to date. First, we have admitted that there is a need for change in the present education system of today. We have recognized three classes, those of special ability, those that are incompetent, and those that are of average. We have shown that the purpose of education is to make the individual better acquainted with the conditions with which he is surrounded so that he can take advantage of those conditions of life in which he finds himself and better his condition in the world by taking advantage of the opportunities that are afforded him, and these opportunities are afforded him through the benefits of higher education. We have shown that by receiving higher education the individual can make his life a more happy one, a more complete one and thus better himself in the world.

The second speaker of the Negative has shown that the change that the Affirmative advocates is harmful to society. They create two distinct classes, the high intellectual class and the low intellectual class, and in between that we have a great gap into which the average falls, and with these two classes, one that is so much above the other, we cannot co-operate to advance the civilization of today.

We have shown also that a higher education is beneficial to the individual because it raises that individual economically. He uses his knowledge to better his condition in life and, therefore, he raises his economic situation and thus raises the standards of living.

We have admitted that there are two faults in the present educational system, first, that of over-crowding and, second, the retardation of the student of special ability. We have shown that over-crowding can easily be remedied by expansion and thus we are doing away with over-crowding and then we have presented our counter-plan, a plan of segregation, into which we divide the students into two distinct classes, the student of special ability who can advance himself rapidly and efficiently, and the student of average ability who can enter into fields of higher education and thus not be entirely eliminated. We there-

fore believe that the plan advocated by the Negative will be a remedy for the present-day conditions, and it will also take care of the student of average ability who can then better his condition in life. I thank you.

CHAIRMAN—The first rebuttal on the Affirmative team will be Mr. Wilson.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Lawrence Wilson, Swarthmore

The first thing that I want to stress in this rebuttal is that our side does not, as doubtless our opponents had hoped, our side does not advocate the limitation of college education. We have shown you the difference between higher education and college education. We want you to bear in mind, in spite of what may be said, that we do not advocate the limitation of college education, we expect to give that to an even larger group of people, through the medium of our Junior College, and then enable those who are able to go on to go on and do real things, to go ahead with higher education.

Then, I should like to ask you all a question. I am confident that most of us who are here this evening—not all of us—are familiar with the customs of debate. I am confident that this is so because I know very well the character of my audience. It is my idea that the position held by the Negative should stand firmly upon the status quo. They have put great emphasis upon the fact that they have a plan. Now, in my mind, the job of having plans belongs to the Affirmative; that the Negative should stand on status quo, therefore, when they are advocating a plan of their own they are not standing pat, they are trying to sit on the fence.

Also, I would like to ask them if New York University has any one who is so generous as John D. Rockefeller to pass them out a check every time they want to expand.

CHAIRMAN—I think our rebuttals are proving to be very interesting and if we can expect as much from the next four rebuttals I am sure you don't want to hear the chairman say any more than is absolutely necessary, so I will call on Mr. Newman to give the second rebuttal for the Negative.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Sanford Newman, New York

There seems quite a bit of doubt as to just what the position of the Negative is. Now, the position of the Negative is not to advocate any status quo. There can be such a thing known as pure negative, that is, just refutation of every one of the arguments of the Affirmative. That, at times, is very good and at times is more or less weak. We believe that in this case it would be too dangerous and we are putting, therefore, more substance into our talk. We believe that their plan is not the proper plan; we believe that there are faults, the Negative admits there are, but what we are advocating is that their change from the status quo is not the proper change and, therefore, we are disagreeing with them upon that certain point.

Now, the Affirmative has asked me whether or not New York University has any such donors as John D. Rockefeller. Well, I might say we have, quite a few, and just recently a committee, headed by Catharine Coolidge and Governor Roosevelt, has said that two hundred and fifty thousand dollars will be given to New York University to further building programs in order to meet crowded facilities in the school. Recently a new building, costing over one million dollars, a School of Education, has been erected at New York University twelve stories high, and it is believed that it will accomodate five thousand students.

In New York they don't build on credit and the money is coming from some place (laughter); but just to return to their plan, I want to make certain things clear. They say—now, see if we can't get this logically and see what they are driving at—they say, "High school education encroaches on the first or second year of college education." Therefore, the first or second year of college is merely high school education, perhaps a little extended, so they class the first and second year as a Junior College. That's a name for it; you might also call it "extended high school." And they say that the higher education comes in the Senior College. Now the question is not what to do with the Junior College; we are not interested in high school; they were behind the high school, we are above it, we are discussing Senior College, and the question is should the students of special ability be the only ones allowed to enter this Senior College or

not and we believe the students of special ability should not be the only ones for various reasons. We have shown that it is a benefit to society. Now, take our present day business system, there is a great deal of competition, it necessitates the survival of the fittest. That firm is successful whose every unit co-operates, everyone well trained and working together, under the leadership, we will admit, of one man, but he could not do it all successfully, he is dependent upon the various units and they require well-trained men and the college turned out the well-trained men. They enable men to understand the monotony of life and get away from the routine of the job, and benefit society and in doing that he benefits himself, benefits the economic conditions because, receiving a higher wage he is free with money and there is a general increase of tone all around. Therefore, we believe higher education should not be restricted to students of special ability.

CHAIRMAN—Again, we find a direct conflict of opinion, a thing which is entirely too infrequent in our debates in a good many cases, and I am going to go right ahead and ask Mr. Owen of the Affirmative to continue with the second rebuttal.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Ralph Owen, Swarthmore

Why, say the friends of Thomas Jefferson, wouldn't the masses want higher education; of course education is important, so far as it goes, and they give us a sad picture of China, no education, picture the people with no money. Of course we agree to it. But they are forgetting that everybody does not have the same ability; mass education is all right up to a certain extent, but it is like an automobile race, a car can go up to a certain speed but can't go any faster so it might as well drop out. It's the same with education. Some students drop out at Sixth Grade, some in the Junior Year and others go all the way up, and a large majority, as in the case of the Illinois Survey, should drop out before they get up to higher education. Of course, the more students, the more money and the more culture, sort of a vicious circle, but unfortunately, that doesn't always work. Of course higher education must teach us how to raise

a family, how to live better and behave and have good manners. We are forgetting that we can't have higher education to do that; if students don't learn that in secondary schools where they are supposed to learn it, they are just out of luck; higher education doesn't have time for that, it is supposed to train them specifically for their life's work.

My opponent said one thousand students in the University of Wisconsin had a bad curriculum. That was their reason, possibly, rather than being just dumb. Of course, when you realize that these tests have been used on a hundred and twenty thousand students for thirty years, rather than three, they are certainly very accurate, and the results at Brown University have shown their accuracy every time.

Then there is another thing; luckily I read the *New York Times* this morning when I was supposed to be in Political Science Class, and I find Henry Ford is giving a hundred million dollars to education, but it is not for higher education. He wants everyone when they go out for an education to have a certain amount of vocational training and it is for these boys and girls who have to drop out of high schools to give them education, and it is for those people he wants to spend one hundred million dollars and establish vocational schools all over the country. So I wish you'd read the *New York Times* more carefully.

THIRD NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Maurice Bernstein, New York

MR. CHAIRMAN, FRIENDS: Sorry to find that I did not read the *Times* correctly, but I admit that Mr. Ford said that young men should get vocational training but, after all, isn't vocational training higher education, members of the Affirmative? What I mean by that is when a student goes to a vocational school, a technical school, he is getting knowledge that fits him for a certain profession, along the lines of chemical engineering, mechanical appliances, or things that pertain to the machinery of our machine age, therefore that is higher education in his line. It is the same for him to learn about machinery, as it is for our girls who intend to be teachers to go to college to learn the problems of teaching students in the class room. We admit

that those who can't graduate should not go to school, that is, to keep lingering on and spending money, but we feel that when the Affirmative brings out the fact of a Senior College for a higher education, they still are not giving a chance to the student of average ability. What is the difference whether they give that student those few years in the Junior College—we are very glad they have done that for our students of average ability—but it is the same as teasing an animal, you present something in front of it and keep pulling it away; in other words, you are giving him a few extra years of education and then, when he finally reaches the capacity where he is able to take on education, you say, "Now you can't go to our Senior College." As I say, in limiting these students of average ability they are forgetting him again; they do not take him into consideration. After all, higher education is anything that tends to give knowledge, that tends to give a basis upon which he can build his education. Then, if I may repeat, they are limiting again the student of average ability. The debate is not whether we are going to limit it in the Junior College, or wait until they reach the Senior College, but the fact is that we are limiting at a certain point the average student, which means that the average student is not given the opportunity. Therefore, we of the Negative most firmly believe that the average student should be given this opportunity for the points that we named before, the fact that it is harmful to society in that it does not get this added education, the fact that with this higher education, even tho it may come under a name which the members of the Affirmative call a Senior College, it is still education, that it will harm society and that it will harm the individual in the fact that he is not given a chance and that we, the Negative, not purely negative as my worthy colleague has brought out, have given a plan that does away with the problems as presented today, that is, the over-crowding and the fact that the student of average ability holds down the student of special ability. We show that by opening our doors to these students, whether the name of our college be Junior or Senior, that we are giving him the opportunity; that in itself, the fact that we are raising the standards of the country—as I spoke about—economically, we are giving him an opportunity, therefore whether it be that we limit him at the doorstep of the Senior College or at the doorstep of what my worthy opponents would call a Junior College, really an extension of the high

school, the fact is that the student of average ability should not be kept out of that element which we call higher education and, therefore, we the members of the Negative team most firmly believe that higher education should not be limited to students of special ability. I thank you.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

William Kain, Swarthmore

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: First of all, I want to remedy one of our opponents' major mistakes. They have these terms all confused. In the first place, they more or less assume higher education to be college. They say that under our plan—which they seem not to understand—that our Junior College is just high school, that they are synonymous. I did not say that at all. Junior College gives us that general atmosphere and general ability to adjust oneself to life, which is obtainable in college; higher education consists more of a specialized line and under that, they mistook a specialized line as vocational training, therefore, they say, vocational training is higher education. Would you say that the student who went to high school and took a commercial course, specializing, maybe, in woodwork or carpentry or something like that, has higher education? It is that specialized training after we have already had the general training obtained in college. Thus they really adopt our plan in their plan of segregation, for by their segregation and separating those students of ability, they really do limit higher education for they give them that specialized training, those people of exceptional capacity, that the average student is not given.

Also, they say we do not give the person of average ability the benefits he can obtain. These benefits, as I tried to show and thought I had, are those benefits at college. We admit they can get these benefits at college, but as Professor Wood showed they cannot get the benefits of higher education and, therefore, we lead them into Junior College which gives them the benefits of college work in secondary education; but higher education, coming under the Senior College work, we deny them for it is a waste of their time, for they cannot attain these results and it is a waste of the time of the exceptional student for he is held

back. This has been recognized by our opponents—I thank them—in their plan of segregation, therefore, in advancing their plan, they really adopt our whole idea in just slightly different words. They limit higher education—as we do—for the average student is not capable of it, and they give the average student the benefits of a college education which we give them in Junior College; therefore, we give the exceptional student the greatest benefit he can obtain and we give the average student the greatest benefit he can obtain and that third class, which they have admitted cannot gain anything, of course would have flunked out long ago; therefore, we give the greatest benefit to the individual and raise the educational standards. In this way we also raise the whole standard of life in general; we increase the educational influences throughout life, we raise the standards of civilization just as, no doubt, Matthew Arnold had in his mind at one time.

CHAIRMAN—Friends, that concludes the formal debate, and I am sure I am glad that I am not in the position of the three judges, for they certainly have a difficult task before them to decide on the winners of this debate. But while they are doing that, while we are waiting for a decision, the speakers of the Affirmative and Negative have consented to answer any questions, or to take part in any open forum discussion in which any members of the audience may desire to indulge and so I therefore declare the floor open for any questions or informal discussion which the audience may desire.

PROF. E. L. HUNT—I would like to ask for a statement from each side as to what they mean by a higher education.

CHAIRMAN—I believe the Affirmative, perhaps, should define their terms first.

MR. KAIN—By higher education we mean that higher training, more unified and specialized, which comes after a general education which is given in our plan of a Junior College. We have the general atmosphere, which is the idea of our college, then the specified, specialized and unified education consisting of that higher training.

CHAIRMAN—Will one of the gentlemen of the Negative define that?

MR. NEWMAN—What we mean by higher education in this case is something beyond the secondary school, and now, they claim that the vocational school is not higher education. We claim that the vocational school is higher education for this

reason: you take a student who desires to become an artist, or, say, a novelist. He wants to be a novelist or writer of ability, he goes to college and takes courses in poetry and literature for background and for writing mechanics. What is he doing? Merely getting the mechanics of his line. Now, we maintain that this college is higher education because there is a definite gap between high school and college or else there would be no entrance examinations to a college; why, you wouldn't have anything such as a four year high school, you'd have fourth year high school, fifth year, sixth, seventh, and so forth, you wouldn't have four years of high school, and freshman year of college. There is a definite gap between college and high school and we believe that this college gives you higher education because higher education is that which allows you to excel, allows you to fit yourself for some line of endeavor. If you're becoming a novelist, you learn the mechanics of the writing game. If you are becoming an engineer or lawyer, what are you doing, learning the mechanics of that profession, learning the mechanics of that line of endeavor, and they are synonymous whether given you in a vocational school or college. After all, that is only an arbitrary name given to an institution of learning, trying to fit you for life, and that is what we believe to be higher education.

PROFESSOR E. L. HUNT—What is the difference between higher education and liberal education?

CHAIRMAN—Was that addressed to a member of the Negative?

PROFESSOR HUNT—Mr. Newman's speech led into it. I would be glad to hear him offer an explanation, or either side.

DR. R. D. OWEN—May I suggest an answer to your question? The great majority of our colleges say that their purpose is to give a liberal education. But ninety-nine out of a hundred students who go to that college turn their liberal education into a vocational education because they want to be able better to earn money the minute they get out. They want to utilize it immediately; therefore, they just turn the concept around. I would stress the fact that it is giving a liberal education but the student turns it into a vocational education because they want to go out and earn money.

MR. NEWMAN—As the gentleman just said, college believes in giving a liberal education and we believe that higher education includes the liberal education. For instance, our medical schools,

Johns Hopkins, Columbia College of Physicians, and so forth, give what is known, well, it is post-liberal, the college gives you a liberal education and the medical and law school build upon the liberal education. The liberal education is the background where they drill you in the fundamentals, and the higher schools of learning, the medical schools, are what might be termed refineries, polish up the fundamentals, develop them and turn you out to be full-fledged members of a profession, but we believe this liberal education must be included in the term "higher education" because you can't say that it is enough to say that a medical school and the law school is higher education because it isn't altogether higher education, it can't be without the liberal education, and so we include the liberal education in the higher education.

PROFESSOR HUNT—Then do I understand you that no vocational training would be higher education unless it would have been preceded by liberal education? Perhaps the other side might answer that.

MR. KAIN—If by vocational education you mean just high school training along special lines, I would say that that wasn't higher education; but higher education would include vocational education if it had that general background, that liberal education, which is the purpose of the Junior College of our plan; and then to go in to higher education, the Senior College, which is specialized in the unified work which gives that more or less vocational or, if you wish, professional, education; thus by going through college in the first two years you would gain the liberal education so much desired and the college benefits, then in the last two years, in higher education, the student who was capable could gain the benefits of that higher education, that specialized or professional education.

MR. NEWMAN—I gave the example of the medical school and I said to enter a medical school one needs a liberal education. Now, a medical school is really a third step, or a fourth step, grammar school, high school, college and then medical school. Now, that's only one example, and for the medical school the liberal education must be gotten at a college. But suppose we have a man who wants to be an expert accountant or an efficiency expert. He comes to a commercial high school but he is not satisfied with that; he is in the secondary step now; now there is only one more step for him to go, through the third

step, and that is a commercial college, a school of commerce. There won't be a fourth step above it because there isn't any. Therefore, his liberal education is received in the secondary school; it all depends upon which profession you pick out.

CHAIRMAN—Is there any further open forum discussion? I don't want to cut unduly short this very interesting discussion.

MR. THOMAS CHAMBERS—I would like to ask one question, of either of the teams. How are you going to be sure that you are differentiating between persons of special ability and between persons of mediocre ability?

MR. NEWMAN—Well, the question, it so happens is worded, not how but "should," in this case. The question is "Should you or should you not restrict our higher education to students of special ability." The question is not how to determine the special ability, but if you think it over a few minutes you will see what I mean. We have a thing known as higher education. The question is, should we allow only students of special ability in there. The question is not how we are going to determine, that's an entirely different debate, that's a debate upon plans of determining that. However, I might say that psychologists today have certain aptitude tests—I don't mean intelligence tests—they are slightly different. They have arrived at a thing known as an intelligence quotient and I believe they set that to students of special ability of 20. They take the chronological age, say twenty years, and take the mental age, which they determine by test and divide that and get the intelligence quotient. I don't know if I have the statistics here or not, because we are not arguing that question, but I think we can prove that it has been highly successful and it is not an intelligence test, it is an aptitude test.

CHAIRMAN—Does one of the members of the Affirmative wish to reply to that question or not?

MR. WILSON—I merely want to add to what the previous speaker has said in that in our plan the Junior College would be in close connection with the Senior College, and in the Junior College the student would be under observation, subject to examinations and to interviews and all the methods that are now used to determine the better students as they are admitted to college. Therefore, we feel that because the Junior College and the Senior College would be in such close connection, that these methods could be carried on to better advantage than they are today.

MR. ROBERT CAPEL—I am wondering if he means there a student of special ability, or does he mean that he would be selecting a man who has reached a certain attainment in a given subject. I am wondering if there isn't a difference there which he is missing, between attainment and ability; in other words, he is determining on grades given for attainment, rather than for ability. Am I getting anywhere?

MR. WILSON—Well, I did leave that out; I think that there is a difference and attainments could be distinguished by means of interviews and general observation from actual potentialities, that is, what could be accomplished can be determined from what has been accomplished.

MRS. EILEEN GALLOWAY—I don't know whether this was brought up while I was out of the room; if it was, just disregard it, that is, take any one individual student, who may be very good in one thing and average in another and poor in another. Any one person.

MR. NEWMAN—That is just what we meant by students of special ability; as we said, it is an ability to excel, in our definition it is ability to excel in one line or lines of endeavor; that is, he may possess special ability in one line or in more than one line and under our plan of segregation, by segregating we would give such a curricula that he could expand in that subject in which he excels. We admit that the present system does not allow him to do that, he has to take up a lot of courses that won't allow him to do that, but we believe our plan would remedy that.

CHAIRMAN—Is there any further discussion? If there is no further discussion, I guess we are ready for the judges' decision.

First of all, I would like to say that in four years of debating experience in Swarthmore, I have listened to or taken part in very few more interesting debates. It often happens that the two sides don't definitely clash; the two sides both talk about the same thing or have the same idea in mind but talk of it in different terms. I feel tonight we have had a very definite clash which has proved not only a very interesting debate but also a very exciting one.

As chairman of the debate I would certainly like to congratulate the speakers of both the affirmative and of the negative sides and I now will read you the results of the judges' decision. The Affirmative receives two votes and the Negative one vote.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS ONLY

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Association of American Colleges Bulletin. 15:528-34. D. '29.
Colleges in current literature. R. E. Anderson.
National Education Association of the United States. College
of tomorrow. pa. 10c. The Association. Wash. D.C. '28.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Alpha Kappi Psi. Relation of education and income; a study
made by the Alpha Kappa Psi fraternity for the year 1926-
1927. E. W. Lord. 31p. 50c. Alpha Kappa Psi. 1050
N. Delaware St. Indianapolis.
Boyd, William and Mackenzie, M. M., eds. Towards a new
education. xvii,498p. \$3.50. Knopf. N.Y. '30.
Burton, W. H. Nature and direction of learning. xviii,595p.
\$2.25. D. Appleton. N.Y. '29.
Colorado College. Significance and worth of education. C. C.
Mierow. (Publication, general series no. 156) 16p. Colorado
Springs. '28.
Crawford, A. B. Incentives to study; a survey of student
opinion. xii,194p. \$5. Yale Univ. Press. New Haven. '29.
Good, C. V. Teaching in college and university. xi,557p. \$3.
Warwick and York. Balt. '29.
Gowen, J. W. and Gooch, M. E. Mental attainments of college
students in relation to previous training, environment, and
heredity. (Studies, 2d series no. 5) 45p. \$1.25. pa. 50c.
Univ. of Maine. Orono. '26.
Hawes, J. A. Twenty years among the twenty year olds. ix,
259p. \$3. E. P. Dutton. N.Y. '29.
Herriott, M. E. Attitudes as factors of scholastic success.
(abstract of thesis) 4p. pa. 25c. Univ. of Illinois Press.
Urbana. '29.

- Johnston, J. B. Student aptitude and prediction of student scholarship. (Report survey course no. 10) 20p. pa. 50c. Univ. of Minnesota. Minneapolis. '27.
- Jordan, D. S. Trend of the American university. ix,126p. ltd. ed. \$7.50. Stanford Univ. Press. '29.
- Kelly, R. L., ed. Effective college. xi,302p. \$2. Assn. of American colleges. 111 5th Ave. N.Y. '28.
- Klapper, Paul. Contemporary education, its principles and practices. xxv,660p. \$2.40. D. Appleton. N.Y. '29.
- Knight, E. W. Education in the United States. 558p. \$2.60. Ginn and Co. Bost. '29.
- Little, C. C. Awakening college. 7-282p. \$3. W. W. Norton. N.Y. '30.
- McConn, C. M. College or kindergarten? 275p. pa. \$1. New Republic. N.Y. '28.
- Morgan, Barton and Starrak, J. A., eds. Nature and purpose of education. x,342p. \$2.25. Collegiate Press. Iowa State College. Ames. '29.
- National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Educating for seven point lives. 16p. pa. 10c. The Congress. 1201 16th St. N.W. Wash. D.C. '29.
- Newman, J. H. Idea of a university defined and illustrated. xxv,498p. \$1.60. Loyola Univ. Press. 3441 N. Ashland Ave. Chicago. '27.
- Odell, C. W. Critical study of measures of achievement relative to capacity. (College of Education. Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin no. 45) 58p. 50c. Univ. of Illinois Press. Urbana. '29.
- Odell, C. W. Predicting the scholastic success of college freshmen. (College of Education. Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin no. 37) 54p. pa. 25c. Univ. of Illinois Press. Urbana. '27.
- Phelps, E. M., ed. University debaters' annual, 1927-1928. Too many college students. Vol. XIV. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '28.
- Reeves, F. W. and Russell, J. D. Some aspects of current efforts to improve college instruction. (Bureau of school series. Bulletin vol. I. no. 2) Univ. of Kentucky. Lexington. '28.
- Roback, A. A. Popular psychology. xii,267p. \$2.50. Sci-art Publishers. Cambridge. '28.

- Security-First National Bank. Six collegiate decades. 111p. pa. gratis. The Bank. 561 S. Spring St. Los Angeles. '29.
- Stalnaker, J. M. and Remmers, H. H. What kind of high schools contribute to college failures? (Studies in higher education no. 14) 39p. 25c. Purdue Univ. Lafayette, Ind. '30.
- Students speak out; a symposium from twenty-two colleges. 269p. pa. \$1. New Republic. N.Y. '29.
- Thomson, G. H. Modern philosophy of education 7-283p. \$3.50. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '29.
- Whitehead, A. N. Aims of education, and other essays. vi, 247p. Macmillan. N.Y. '29.

PERIODICALS

- American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. Proceedings. 1929:76-81. Of what use are mental-educational tests for college students? H. H. Remmers.
- American Association of University Professors Bulletin. 15: 444-7. O. '29. Business and education; an American view. C. F. Taeusch.
- American Association of University Professors Bulletin. 15: 447-51. O. '29. Industry and the universities; a British view. H. F. S. Stokes.
- American Association of University Professors Bulletin. 15: 468-75. O. '29. Scope and sphere of a university. G. J. Laing.
- American Industries. 30:80-5. O. '29. Relations of industry to public education. Howell Cheney.
- American Journal of Sociology. 34:856-73. Mr. '29. Optimism and pessimism in college environments. H. H. Jasper.
- American Magazine. 109:36-7+. F. '30. How colleges rob men of priceless years; an interview with E. W. Berry. M. K. Wisheart.
- American Mercury. 18:129-36. O. '29. Four years of college. Samuel Lipshutz.
- American School Board Journal. 79:33-4. D. '29. Are mental tests in the schools democratic? John Dixon.
- Association of American Colleges Bulletin. 15:130-50. Mr. '29. Cooperation between schools and colleges in raising intellectual standards. Raymond Walters.

- Association of American Colleges Bulletin. 16:42-52. Mr. '30. Intellectual life in the colleges. L. P. Eisenhart.
- Association of American Universities. Journal of Proceedings and Addresses. 1928:43-53. Scope and sphere of a university. G. J. Laing.
- Atlantic Monthly. 141:638-44. My. '28. Universities and their function. A. N. Whitehead.
- Atlantic Monthly. 144:447-56. O. '29. Convention of going to college; an appeal to parents. W. I. Nichols.
- Atlantic Monthly. 145:278-81. F. '30. Freshmen.
- Atlantic Monthly. 146:60-3. Jl. '30. Waste of brains. M. R. Ridley.
- Bulletin of High Points. 11:3-7. N. '29. Complete living as the goal of education. H. H. Horne.
- Bulletin of High Points. 12:3-5. F. '30. I. Q's compared with achievement. Adolph Klein.
- Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals. 24:46:51. Ja. '29. Outstanding characteristics of honor pupils of the University of Chicago high schools. V. C. Lohr.
- Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals. 25:248-58. Mr. '29. Recognition of individual differences. H. H. Ryan.
- Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals. 25:318-28. Mr. '29. Relation of the independent junior college to the university and the evolution of the weak four-year college into a strong junior college. F. W. Reeves.
- Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals. 25:328-39. Mr. '29. Present status of the junior college movement. F. L. Whitney.
- Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals. 25:348-59. Mr. '29. Suggested orientation program for junior colleges. J. W. Harbeson.
- California Quarterly of Secondary Education. 5:127-30. Ja. '30. Study of continuity of lower division enrollment in relation to selection of scholastically able students. F. C. Touton.
- California Quarterly of Secondary Education. 5:243-8. Ap. '30. Relative scholastic achievement of native students and junior college transfers at the University of Southern California. R. R. G. Watt and F. C. Touton.
- Century. 118:58-60. My. '29. Intellectual carelessness. C. F. Thwing.

- Chicago Schools Journal. 11:241-6. Mr. '29. Inspiration of the immeasurable. C. S. Camenisch.
- Chicago Schools Journal. 11:252-3. Mr. '29. Great American experiment. J. L. Bache.
- Chicago Schools Journal. 11:255-6. Mr. '29. Learning inventory. V. O. Graham.
- Child Study. 6:412. Mr. '29. Defining capacity and training.
- Commerce and Finance. 19:360. F. 12, '30. Field that philanthropists seem to overlook: women's colleges. M. Sykes.
- Current History. 27:499-50. Ja. '28. Giving honor students free rein at college. Frank Aydelotte.
- Current History. 30:387-95. Ja. '29. Revolution in college educational methods in America. Addison Hibbard.
- Current History. 32:71-5. Ap. '30. Mass education in America. John Dugdale.
- Current History. 32:717-20. Jl. '30. Transforming the American college system. A. E. Morgan.
- Current History. 32:962-4. Ag. '30. Meaning of an American college degree. A. B. Hart.
- Curriculum Study and Educational Research Bulletin. 3:40-122. N. '28. Report on Stanford achievement test.
- Delineator. 115:50. O. '29. For parents in distress; how to train children of the non-college type. J. G. Cosgrave.
- Education. 47:272-9. Ja. '27. Social aspect of college entrance restriction. Benjamin Deutsch.
- Education. 47:513-29. My. '27. College records and success in life. H. A. Smith.
- Education. 48:593-601. Je. '28. Blind alley toward the stars; where college and life fail to meet. R. C. Francis.
- Education. 49:398-405. Mr. '29. I. Q. and other Q's. P. H. Pearson.
- Education. 49:416-23. Mr. '29. Curse of the college. G. H. Estabrooks.
- Education. 49:437-9. Mr. '29. Some symptoms of intelligence. H. T. Eaton.
- Education. 49:613-17. Je. '29. Going to college with a purpose. R. Whitford.
- Education. 50:26-30. S. '29. Democracy in American higher education. W. S. Brooks.
- Education. 50:65-74. O. '29. Beyond heredity and environment. P. F. Valentine.

- Education. 50:282-92. Ja. '30. Extra-curriculum activities in their true light. G. D. Houston.
- Education. 50:350-5. F. '30. Who is a good student? F. R. Copper.
- Education. 50:437-41. Mr. '30. Awakening of personality. R. K. Morton.
- Education. 50:537-42. My. '30. A comparative study of college students with high and low grades. G. F. Powell.
- Educational Administration and Supervision. 14:610-23. D. '28. Overlapping of courses in education.
- Educational Administration and Supervision. 15:58-66. Ja. '29. What modifications in the technique of instruction should be made for superior children? E. H. Sanguinet.
- Educational Administration and Supervision. 15:481-93. O. '29. Scholarship of university students participating in extra-curricular activities. J. E. Knox and R. A. Davis.
- Educational Outlook. 3:220-6. My. '29. Is mediocrity the price of universal education? A. J. Jones.
- Educational Outlook. 4:72-80; 149-55. Ja. Mr. '30. History of the measurement movement. J. E. Malin.
- Educational Record. 10:155-65. Jl. '29. Action; how can we make education meet nationally significant tendencies in American life? C. R. Mann.
- Educational Record. 10:166-78. Jl. '29. America's educational program. F. B. Robinson.
- Educational Research Bulletin. 8:194. My. 1, '29. Predicting success in college. W. W. Charters.
- Educational Review. 69:17-22. Ja. '25. Higher education or the highest. C. A. King.
- Educational Review. 69:225-30. My. '25. Technique in higher education. W. M. Parrish.
- Educational Review. 70:26-31. Je. '25. Is my child to be debarred from college? G. T. Lewis.
- Educational Review (China). 21:119-27. Ap. '29. Necessity for a professional emphasis particularly in higher education. Paul Monroe.
- English Journal (College edition). 18:230-7. Mr. '29. Honors courses in English. P. M. Hicks.
- Forum. 76:498-509. O. '26. Can education increase intelligence? A debate. William McDougall and I. A. Richards.

- Forum. 79:519-26. Ap. '28. Self-education in college. A. L. Lowell.
- Forum. 80:178-86. Ag. '28. Genius, talent and intelligence. M. H. Austin.
- Forum of Education. 7:171-85. N. '29. Relation of temperament and intelligence to scholastic ability. D. W. Oates.
- Harper's Magazine. 152:586-97. Ap. '26. What shall we educate for? Bertrand Russell.
- Harper's Magazine. 154:253-60. Ja. '27. College and the exceptional man. Bernard DeVoto.
- Harper's Magazine. 155:529-38. O. '27. Over-population of the college. J. R. Angell.
- Harper's Magazine. 160:440-7. Mr. '30. Educational leadership in America. Alexander Meiklejohn.
- Harper's Magazine. 160:625-34. Ap. '30. Education: savage and civilized. John Langdon-Davies.
- High School Journal. 12:53-7. F. '29. School and college co-operation in order to reduce freshman failures. F. H. Koos.
- High School Teacher. 5:44. F. '29. Elimination by substitution. F. B. Pearson.
- High School Teacher. 5:263. O. '29. Price of ignorance. F. T. Beck.
- High School Teacher. 5:264-7. O. '29. Sifting modern education; a discussion on what seems to be wrong with it.
- High School Teacher. 5:297-9. N. '29. Recognition of individual differences. H. H. Ryan.
- Illinois Teacher. 18:136. Ja. '30. What is a good school? W. C. Bagley.
- Independent Education. 2:11-12. Ja. '29. Education versus schooling. E. R. Smith.
- Independent Education. 2:9-10. F. '29. Should education be made easy? A. E. Stearns.
- Independent Education. 2:9-13. Mr. '29. Life, liberty, and education. Max McConn.
- Independent Education. 3:3-5. S. '29. Commerce and culture. J. A. Benn.
- Indiana University. Bulletin of the School of Education. 5:9-90. Ja. '29. Development and use of a composite achievement test. W. W. Wright.

- Indiana University. Bulletin of the School of Education. 5: 49-61. Jl. '29. Education and the new world. M. E. Haggerty.
- Industrial Education Magazine. 31:5-7. Jl. '29. Objectives in education. M. W. Haynes.
- Journal of Adult Education. 1:53-6. F. '29. Education for more than the job; a reversion from strict utilitarianism. C. R. Mann.
- Journal of Chemical Education. 7:283-93. F. '30. Education of the superior student. J. J. Abel.
- Journal of Education. 109:499-501. My 6, '29. Making education practical. M. P. Shawkey.
- Journal of Education. 110:405-7. N. 11, '29. Wanted: more college graduates. W. E. Chancellor.
- Journal of Education. 110:581. D. 23, '29. When the college boy and girl come home. A. Dean.
- Journal of Education. 111:38-9. Ja. 13, '30. Factoryized education. S. M. Graves.
- Journal of Education (London). 61:579-82. Ag. '29. Predicting school achievement. D. W. Oates.
- Journal of Educational Psychology. 19:658-65. D. '28. Comparison of aptitude and training tests for prognosis.
- Journal of Educational Psychology. 20:401-16. S. '29. Study of the mental growth curve with special reference to the results of group intelligence tests. C. L. Odom.
- Journal of Educational Psychology. 20:424-33. S. '29. Environmental and character factors involved in scholastic success. 1926-1927 data. F. K. Shuttleworth.
- Journal of Educational Research. 18:345-55. D. '28. Analysis and evaluation of college and university courses in education. W. E. Peik.
- Journal of Educational Research. 19:237-54. Ap. '29. High school subjects as conditioners of college success: implications and theories concerning mental factors and faculties. Herbert Sorenson.
- Journal of Educational Research. 20:327-34. D. '29. Knowledge of success as a motivating influence in college work. I. M. Smith.
- Journal of Educational Research. 21:21-8. Ja. '30. Inconstancy of the I. Q. as measured by repeated group tests. P. Cattell and F. J. Gaudet.

- Journal of Engineering. 19:871-83. My. '29. Honor engineering students: their characteristics and reasons for success. M. E. Herriott.
- Journal of Engineering Education. 19:972-8. Je. '29. Practical impossibilities of "An unpractical education;" reply to J. C. Parker. A. C. Howell.
- Journal of Higher Education. 1:141-8. Mr. '30. Economic effects of education. H. F. Clark.
- Journal of Higher Education. 1:149-53. Mr. '30. Preparation of freshmen. L. C. Pressey.
- Junior High Clearing House. 3:45-7. Ap. '29. What types of achievement tests should be used as a basis for promotion? P. D. Collier and H. H. Miller.
- Junior-Senior High School Clearing House. 4:28-37. S. '29. College-entrance bugaboo. H. W. Smith.
- Kansas University Bulletin of Education. 2:1-28. Ap. '29. Six-year study of selection, persistence and achievement in high school and college. F. P. O'Brien.
- Literary Digest. 101:26. Ap. 6, '29. Ten points for the educational man.
- Literary Digest. 103:34. N. 9, '29. College attendance falling off.
- Literary Digest. 103:30. N. 16, '29. Freshmen getting brighter; Columbia college puts competent freshmen in advanced courses.
- National Education Association Journal. 18:287-90. D. '29. Democracy in education. John Dewey.
- National Education Association Journal. 19:164. My. '30. Idea of a liberal education.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1925:676-82. Equality of educational opportunity. J. J. Tigert.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1928:788-98. Relation of the public schools to higher education. S. M. Dorsey.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1929:319-22. Junior college business education; abstract. H. G. Shields.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1929:504-6. Education as an investment; abstract. G. A. Selke.
- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1929:647-54. Education; what program? what price? F. D. Boynton.

- National Education Association. Proceedings. 1929:690-6. Necessity of coordinating educational activities with public affairs. C. Beck.
- Nation's Schools. 3:55-7. Je. '29. What can America learn from Europe educationally? W. C. Ryan.
- Nation's Schools. 4:31-4. Ag. '29. Does education promote prosperity? M. V. O'Shea.
- Nation's Schools. 4:72-3. O. '29. When is education too costly?
- New Republic. 46:239-41. Ap. 14, '26. Stanford University's experience with the limitation of students. R. L. Wilbur.
- New Republic. 59:13-15. My. 22, '29. College as it might be. H. J. Graham.
- New Republic. 59:13-15. My. 22, '29. College as it might be. when? Douglas Orr.
- New Republic. 63:61-4; 93-6; 123-5; 145-6; 172-6; 204-6. Je. 4-Jl. 9, '30. New education ten years after.
- North American Review. 229:705-12. Je. '30. Business before culture. L. J. Nations.
- Ohio Schools. 7:15. Ja. '29. The grasp and the reach. F. B. Pearson.
- Ohio Schools. 7:233-4. Je. '29. Narrowness of a liberal education. H. E. Davis.
- Ohio Schools. 8:56. F. '30. Whoopee education. Alma Paschall.
- Outlook and Independent. 151:323-6. F. 27, '29. Utopia college: a prospectus. Addison Hibbard.
- Phi Delta Kappa. 11:129-31. F. '29. Triple problem: quantity, quality and economy. W. F. Russell.
- Phi Delta Kappa. 12:71-2. O. '29. Co-operative study pertaining to high school and college students.
- Progressive Education. 7:57-67. Mr. '30. Mental tests. Knight Dunlap.
- Religious Education. 24:273-9. Mr. '29. By-products of the college classroom. G. A. Coe.
- Research Bulletin of the National Education Association. 7:67-74. Mr. '29. Individual differences.
- Review of Reviews. 76:637-8. D. '27. Are book-worms to be the only college men? A. W. Crawford.
- Review of Reviews. 79:101-3. Mr. '29. Democracy or aristocracy?

- Review of Reviews. 80:102-4. Jl. '29. Making millions in college.
- Review of Reviews. 81:102. F. '30. Cataloging the individual.
- Review of Reviews. 81:76-7. Ap. '30. Kindergarten. Max McConn.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:40. D. 7, '29. Colleges in transition.
- Saturday Evening Post. 202:40+. Mr. 1, '30. College education and the job. Elizabeth Frazer.
- School and Society. 20:767-73. D. 20, '24. How to maintain standards without excessive standardization. F. J. E. Woodbridge.
- School and Society. 22:345-50. S. 19, '25. Superior student in the college. C. F. Thwing.
- School and Society. 23:310-12. Mr. 6, '26. Comparison of the scores of college freshmen and seniors on psychological tests. R. S. Ellis.
- School and Society. 23:569-76. My. 8, '26. Individual in mass education. C. E. Seashore.
- School and Society. 23:729-41. Je. 12, '26. Revolt against education. Glenn Frank.
- School and Society. 24:305-12. S. 4, '26. Predictive value of the Yale classification tests. J. E. Anderson and L. T. Spencer.
- School and Society. 24:370-2. S. 18, '26. Psychological test ratings and college entrance age. S. M. Whinery.
- School and Society. 25:469-78. Ap. 23, '27. Education for democracy and the Junior college. C. E. Seashore.
- School and Society. 25:592-6. My. 21, '27. Determination of fitness for college. W. Farrand.
- School and Society. 26:84-8; 114-20; Jl. 16-23, '27. Segregation on the basis of ability. H. W. Miller.
- School and Society. 26:410-14. O. 12, '27. Who should go to college? F. L. McVey.
- School and Society. 26:695-705. D. 3, '27. Aims of a liberal college. A. S. Pease.
- School and Society. 27:395-6. Mr. 31, '28. Fixing of standards in higher education. K. L. Holmes.
- School and Society. 27:403-11. Ap. 7, '28. Challenge to higher education. J. G. Miller.

- School and Society. 27:743-5. Je. 23, '28. Shift of emphasis in higher education; continuation of study after college. W. T. Sanger.
- School and Society. 28:673-5. D. 1, '28. Is the American college still needed? N. E. Byers.
- School and Society. 29:151-2. F. 2, '29. College athletics and scholarship. M. E. Hutchinson.
- School and Society. 29:195-7. F. 9, '29. Educational waste; reply. T. H. Schutte.
- School and Society. 29:228. F. 16, '29. Definition of intelligence. J. P. Gavit.
- School and Society. 29:330-1. Mr. 9, '29. Instalment buying in travel and education. Towne Nylander.
- School and Society. 29:643-4. My. 18, '29. Status of valedictorians and salutatorians in American colleges. R. D. Wellons.
- School and Society. 29:676-7. My. 25, '29. Junior college graduates in the universities. G. M. Okerlund.
- School and Society. 29:784-6. Je. 15, '29. Elusive factors tending to reduce correlations between intelligence test ranks and college grades. F. S. Freeman.
- School and Society. 29:787-93. Je. 22, '29. Selection as a function of American secondary education. W. C. Ryan, jr.
- School and Society. 29:812-14. Je. 22, '29. Honors work in school and college. Julian Park.
- School and Society. 30:76-9. Jl. 20, '29. Who shall say what the nation may expect of American schools? W. J. Cooper.
- School and Society. 30:203-4. Ag. 10, '29. Vocational problems of the college student. W. E. Johnson.
- School and Society. 30:415-18. S. 28, '29. Needed: new life in the colleges. D. C. Jackson.
- School and Society. 30:550-2. O. 19, '29. Problem of elimination from college. N. B. Cuff.
- School and Society. 30:627-32. N. 9, '29. Need of a new-type university. D. E. Phillips.
- School and Society. 30:659-68. N. 16, '29. Contribution of the American college to our national life. J. R. Angell.
- School and Society. 30:847-8. D. 21, '29. Why students fail. P. L. Vogt.

- School and Society. 30:893-6. D. 28, '29. Relative values of intelligence tests and matriculation examinations as a means of estimating probable success in college. C. E. Kellogg.
- School and Society. 31:59-61. Ja. 11, '30. Paradox of American education. Richard Robinson.
- School and Society. 31:161-70. F. 1, '30. Editorial comment.
- School and Society. 31:315-19. Mr. 8, '30. Education is the spirit of life. Frank Cody.
- School and Society. 31:337-9. Mr. 8, '30. Modern scholasticism; get-rich-quick type of orientation course. O. G. Jones.
- School and Society. 31:419-23. Mr. 29, '30. Education in relation to material values. F. G. Blair.
- School and Society. 31:522-5. Ap. 19, '30. Education as selective. W. D. Tait.
- School and Society. 31:569-71. Ap. 26, '30. Orientation and scholasticism; reply to O. G. Jones. C. W. Chenoweth.
- School and Society. 31:693-9. My. 24, '30. Growth of intelligence at the college level. A. L. Rogers.
- School and Society. 32:6-10. Jl. 5, '30. How much money does a college need? D. J. Cowling.
- School and Society. 32:41-4. Jl. 12, '30. Vital values in education. E. R. Pyrtle.
- School and Society. 32:108-18. Jl. 26, '30. Democratic control of education. H. C. Sanborn.
- School Executives Magazine. 48:267-8. F. '29. Proscription of educational opportunity. Chester Newlun.
- School Executives Magazine. 49:8-10. S. '29. Away with high school points and credits. H. A. Toops.
- School Life. 10:97-8. Ja. '25. Let the child advance according to individual ability. W. S. Deffenbaugh.
- School Life. 14:170. My. '29. No danger of too many educated men.
- School Review. 35:167-8. Mr. '27. Intelligence scores and progress through college.
- School Review. 37:16-28. Ja. '29. Secondary period and the university. H. C. Morrison.
- School Review. 37:187-97. Mr. '29. Records of junior-college transfers in the university. W. C. Eells.
- School Review. 37:253. Ap. '29. Waste in education; should schools be restricted to those who could best profit by instruction.

- School Review. 37:406-7. Je. '29. Tuition determined by scholarship.
- School Review. 37:451-6. Je. '29. Trends in college-entrance offerings. F. A. Balyeat.
- School Review. 37:519-30. S. '29. Effectiveness of certain requirements in the selective admission of college students. E. F. Potthoff.
- School Review. 37:576-88. O. '29. Relation of success in certain subjects in high school to success in the same subjects in college. Royal Gilkey.
- School Review. 38:222-6. Mr. '30. Scholarship and success in life. D. R. Leech.
- School Review. 38:443-9. Je. '30. Records of students who entered university with freshman scholarships. G. R. Moon.
- Scientific Monthly. 28:349-58. O. '29. Fitting the college to your boy and girl. A. E. Wiggam.
- Sewanee Review. 37:266-73. Jl. '29. Other side of paradise; college and the common life. Willard Thorp.
- Social Science. 4:141-68. Mr. '29. Future of the college. Leroy Allen.
- Survey. 53:343-4. D. 15, '24. Higher education. A. L. Bass.
- Survey. 62:246-7. My. 15, '29. What profit education?
- World's Work. 49:240-1. Ja. '25. Money value of a college education.
- World's Work. 55:359-73; 556-67; 671-81; 56:196-206; 323-32. F.-Ap., Je.-Jl., '28. Which way, America? higher education answers the question. comp. by Frederick Palmer.
- World's Work. 58:86-91. F. '29. After the deadline. M. M. Stearns.
- World's Work. 58:76-8. Je. '29. Bear market for brains. H. F. Clark.

CHAPTER VIII

THE COTSWORTH THIRTEEN MONTH CALENDAR

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

RESOLVED: *That the Cotsworth Thirteen Month Calendar be adopted.*

This debate was given by four members of the Men's Debating Association of the University of Pittsburgh, and broadcast from the University Studio of Station K D K A, February 22, 1930. The Chairman was Mr. Richard Murphy, instructor in Public Speaking in the University and announcer for the University Radio Studio. This report including the Brief was secured thru the services of Professor W. M. Parrish, Director of Debating and Associate Professor of Public Speaking, University of Pittsburgh.

BRIEF

THE COTSWORTH THIRTEEN MONTH CALENDAR

AFFIRMATIVE

- I. The present Gregorian calendar is not satisfactory.
 - A. It is a patchwork affair, the result of spasmodic accumulations.
 - B. It fails to divide the year into convenient, consistent units—the primary purpose of a calendar.
 - 1. The months are of unequal length.
 - 2. Months begin in no systematic manner.
 - 3. Days do not come on consistent dates.
 - C. The lack of unity causes great inconvenience and expense in the keeping of business statistics.
 - D. The great number of individual and organization endorsements of a new calendar demonstrate the general desire for calendar reform.
- II. The Cotsworth plan offers a scientific, convenient method of dividing the year.
 - A. Months are of equal length, twenty-eight days each.
 - B. Months begin on a Sunday and end on a Saturday, consistently.
 - C. Days and dates are perfectly correlated—Monday is always 2, 9, 16, or 23.
 - D. Floating holidays and holy days are given fixed dates.
- III. The Cotsworth calendar has been tried and proved.
 - A. Many business houses are using the plan.
 - B. The League of Nations recommends the plan as the most practicable for calendar reform.
- IV. Objections to a change of calendar are not well founded.
 - A. The calendar has been changed before.
 - B. Religious opposition is greatly exaggerated, and it will not continue when religionists discover that the Cotsworth plan does not interfere with the spirit of the Sabbath.
 - C. The insertion of Year Day is consistent with the insertion of Pentecost by Moses.

- D. There is a great lack of uniformity at present in the observance of the Sabbath.
- E. There is a slight inconvenience in any progressive step.
- V. There will be no great inconvenience in a change to the Cotsworth plan.
 - A. Conversion tables are simple and accurate.
 - B. The fact that many business houses use the Cotsworth calendar at present along with the Gregorian calendar demonstrates the ease of change.
- VI. There will be no loss of anything valuable if we change to the thirteen-month calendar.
 - A. The most desirable features of the Gregorian calendar are retained.
 - B. Quarterly periods of thirteen weeks each are easily determined.
 - C. New associations with birthdays and holidays will quickly develop.
 - D. The lowered costs of keeping records, because of the simplicity and convenience of a consistent calendar, will more than offset any increased cost arising from an extra monthly reckoning.
- VII. A change to the Cotsworth plan is wise and expedient.
 - A. The thirteen-month plan gives us a calendar as nearly perpetually perfect as it is possible to devise.
 - B. The plan is complete—it makes further reform unnecessary.

NEGATIVE

- I. The present Gregorian calendar is satisfactory.
 - A. It is an accurate measure of the year.
 - B. A scientific adjustment of the units within the year is impossible.
 - I. Month, week, and day do not divide evenly into the year.
- II. Adoption of the Cotsworth calendar would cause serious inconvenience.
 - A. Anniversaries, holidays, and birthdays would have to be redated and so lose their associations.
 - B. All dates in existing books would become inaccurate and have to be relocated with a conversion table.
- III. The Cotsworth calendar would be opposed by religious bodies.

- A. Mohammedans, Jews, Greek Catholics and Seventh Day Adventists object to breaking the seven-day cycle of the week by the insertion of year-days and leap-days.
- IV. There is no popular discontent with the present calendar.
 - A. Most of the propaganda for a change comes from one man.
 - 1. It is financed by George Eastman.
 - B. The League of Nations committee on calendar reform found that there was no widespread demand for change.
- V. The convenience of a thirteen-month plan to some business accountants is not a reason for change.
 - A. The whole world should not be disturbed for the convenience of a few.
 - B. Accountants are able to use a thirteen-month calendar at present without disturbing the rest of the world.
- VI. The necessary change in dates would work serious disadvantage to the general public.
 - A. Important time-associations (as dates for planting, harvesting, and the like) would be lost.
 - B. Existing deeds, contracts, leases, and public records would have to be redated or else the new and old calendars would both be in use at the same time.
- VII. The advantages to business are doubtful.
 - A. All computations involving the relation of yearly to monthly and quarterly totals would become more difficult.
 - 1. Thirteen is a prime number.
 - B. The computation of interest and discount periods would be confused.
 - C. Business concerns would lose the benefit of month by month comparisons with previous years.
 - 1. The length of the month would be changed.
 - D. A change from twelve to thirteen months would increase labor and costs in many businesses.
 - 1. Monthly statements, balances, pay days, metre readings, magazine issues, etc., would be increased in number.
 - E. Accuracy of weekly and monthly comparisons is impossible under any calendar.
 - 1. There are too many variables such as weather changes, holidays, etc.

THE COTSWORTH THIRTEEN MONTH CALENDAR

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

CHAIRMAN

Richard Murphy, Pittsburgh

GOOD EVENING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Once each year members of the Men's Debating Association of the University of Pittsburgh meet in the University Studio of K D K A to discuss for you a question of particular interest. This year the question is one of a change in our calendar.

Calendar reform, you know, is in the air. Recently the National Committee on Calendar Simplification submitted a report of its findings to the Secretary of State in Washington. A resolution for a committee to investigate the advisability of calendar reform and for an appropriation to cover the costs of such an investigation has been introduced in Congress by a Representative of the district in which this University is located. In fact the question is so immediate that many proponents of a thirteen month calendar, the suggested reform, hope to have the new plan go into effect January 1, 1933, the nearest year that begins on Sunday, a characteristic of the Cotsworth Calendar. Washington's Birthday is an appropriate occasion for a debate on the calendar, for one of the most contested details in calendar reform is the settlement of a date which to observe the birthday should we change our present system of recording months and dates.

With all this activity for calendar revision, many people are beginning to wonder what the Cotsworth plan is, and what advantages and disadvantages it may have. The nature of the suggested plan will be explained quite clearly in the course of the debate, I think, but if you want a very graphic sample of the Cotsworth month, turn on your calendar to June of this year. You will find, of course, thirty days. Now strike away 29 and

30, and you will have a model month, the kind you may be using in 1933 if the Affirmative can persuade you this evening that they are right.

1930		JUNE					1930
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
29	30						

We have in the Studio this evening members of the Men's Debating Association, members of the Women's Debating Association, and guests. Any applause you may hear, and any hisses, or any other signs of approval or disapproval that cannot be classified under these two usual forms of demonstration you may identify as coming from them.

The members of the Association who will tell us what they think of our present calendar and of the Cotsworth plan, are, for the Affirmative, Mr. Jess Spirer and Mr. Edward T. Crowder, Jr.; and for the Negative, Mr. Robert McClurkin and Mr. Samuel Strauss.

And now the introductory speaker in this debate on the proposition Resolved: That the Cotsworth thirteen month calendar be adopted, is Mr. Jess Spirer, first speaker for the Affirmative.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Jess Spirer, Pittsburgh

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The subject for debate this evening, as our chairman has already announced, concerns the adoption of the Cotsworth thirteen month calendar.

In all probability you are already thinking: "Why, what is wrong with our present calendar? It seems to be all right, with the possible exception that there are not enough holidays in it."

True, our present calendar does seem satisfactory—if not examined too critically. In reality, however, it is one of the worst examples of patchwork ever inflicted upon humanity.

Our opponents will probably try to tell you and me this evening that a calendar change is something new, and that a change will result in innumerable troubles. I shall be surprised if we are not told that the Gregorian calendar is good enough, and that it will last many thousands of years before a serious change must be made; in other words, we can just patch the calendar up and keep it going.

This practice, unfortunately, has been going on too long. The history of our calendar reveals various changes. Let us begin with Julius Caesar, grand duke of Rome. He went to Egypt, so our histories tell us, and after a pleasant visit with Cleopatra, returned with some new notions about recording time. The current calendar didn't suit his need exactly, so he changed it, and in the revision named one month after himself. His month, July, had to be equal to any other month. To make it so, he took a day away from February and added it to July. This calendar continued successfully until the time of Augustus. Now Augustus was the nephew and heir of Julius, and didn't like the idea of having August with only thirty days, while July had thirty-one. So Augustus reached over into February, as had Julius, and took a day away. He added this day to August so that August now had thirty-one days, July had thirty-one days, and poor little February was left out in the cold with only twenty-eight.

Well, this calendar continued until the time of Pope Gregory, about fifteen centuries later. One fine morning the renowned Papal ruler awoke to find the calendar was ten days behind the solar schedule. The Julian year was eleven minutes longer than the solar year, and over a period of centuries ten days had accumulated. The days were there all right but they didn't fit into the calendar. What to do! What to do! Gregory did the only logical thing there was to do. He struck the ten days from the calendar by decreeing that in that year August 5 should be called August 15 so that the calendar would conform to nature.

In recent years the public has discovered that there is something wrong with this Gregorian timekeeper. Moses B. Cotsworth recognized this trouble and set to work to evolve a plan that would direct us through the wilderness. When he was

traffic manager for the British North Eastern Railway, he announced his new thirteen-month calendar.

From this rather brief history, it is evident that the Gregorian calendar was not handed down to man from above, intact. It is a man-made device, and should be treated as such. It has been changed again and again before reaching its present form. From such a colorful history we may draw two conclusions: In the first place, a calendar change is nothing new. Calendars have been changed in the past, and will, in all probability, be changed in the future. Relatively, there will be no more confusion resulting from a change at the present time than resulted from a change under Gregory. In the second place, we have at present, not a scientific calendar, but one that has been patched over several times to make it fit the needs of the occasion and of nature. It has been changed many times, one change involving the loss of ten days.

The purpose of a calendar, we all know, is to facilitate the reckoning of time. A good calendar should make the various periods as uniform as possible. In other words, the weeks should be seven days long at all times; the months should all have the same number of days and the years should also be consistent. There should be a correlation between the day of the week and the date; each day should fall on a definite date.

In our present Gregorian calendar, we have twelve months. But—and here is the darky in the woodpile—these months are uneven. There is no uniformity in our present month, since it varies from twenty-eight days to thirty-one days in length; hence, it loses value as an accurate timekeeper.

Consider our Cotsworth calendar. Under the Cotsworth calendar, the year will be divided into thirteen months of equal length. Each month will have exactly twenty-eight days: four weeks of seven days each. February will now have as many days as July, and August will have no more than June. The months will all be of the same length; providing a long needed uniformity, lacking in the Gregorian calendar.

Regularly and uniformity are desirable in any system of weights and measures. Suppose our pound would weigh sixteen ounces on Monday, fifteen on Tuesday, fourteen on Wednesday, thirteen on Thursday, with other variations on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. This condition would certainly be deplorable. And yet, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are using a system of timekeeping which varies equally as much. Seven

months have thirty-one days; four months have thirty days; and one lone month has twenty-eight days. Here, obviously, there is no regularity, no uniformity. . . just a patchwork job.

Furthermore, under our present calendar there is no correlation between the day and the date: a necessary feature in a good calendar. The month at present may begin on any one of the days of the week. February began on a Saturday, April will begin on a Tuesday and May will begin on a Thursday. Here there is no correlation between the day and the date, since the first of the month may fall on any one of the week days.

Consider the Cotsworth calendar. Each month will begin on a Sunday and will end on a Saturday. In other words Sunday is always the first of the month, the eighth, the fifteenth and the twenty-second, under the Cotsworth calendar. In like manner, Monday is the second, the ninth, sixteenth and so forth. Here there is a definite relationship between the day and the date. Each day will fall on a definite date; likewise, each date will fall on a definite day, every day, every month, every year.

Now fifty-two weeks of exactly seven days will total only 364 days. The last day of the year, under the Cotsworth calendar, will be inserted between December 28 and January 1, and will be known as either Peace Day or Year Day. This day is set aside as an international holiday, and will make the 365th day of the year, rounding out the calendar.

From this brief discussion, it is readily seen that the Cotsworth calendar is regular and uniform. This uniform time-keeper, when applied to business, aids in straightening out much of our present confusion in the statistical departments. A business, we all know, must be run scientifically. A business head says to himself: Should I buy, or should I sell? Must I lay off men, or am I to hire them? How much must I buy or sell? Now these questions usually are not answered on the spur of the moment. There must be made, first of all, a comparison between the business trends of the months. Is business gaining or decreasing? And then comes the interesting problem: How can I compare the business of March with that of February, when March has thirty-one days and February has twenty-eight, and March has five Saturdays whereas February has only four?

In other words, there is no real basis for comparison here.

A business man cannot compare the business of one month with that of another for the simple reason that the months are uneven in length. With the months of twenty-eight days each, there is no difficulty encountered. The months in the Cotsworth calendar are equal in length. It is an easy matter to compare business records, and decide on the future policy of the firm. And that is why many progressive business houses are using the Cotsworth thirteen-month calendar.

The Cotsworth calendar is not something new. It has been tried and proved. Recently, the League of Nations proposed it as a calendar worthy of serious consideration in the event that a calendar change is to made. Today, there are at least eighty large corporations throughout the country using it in their business accounting. Not so long ago, the well known firm of Sears, Roebuck adopted it. Eastman Kodak has found it to be valuable assistance in the keeping of statistics and accounts. Hickock Belt Inc. testifies to its worth. Fuller Brush has adopted it. Loews Inc. of New York are using it. These are but a few of the many firms using the Cotsworth calendar. After adopting it, not one of these concerns is willing to revert to the Gregorian calendar. These men realize that such a patchwork affair is not in keeping with the modern scientific trend. They see into the future, and have merely taken the step of adopting the calendar a few years before the rest of the world takes it over.

In summary, then, we find that the Cotsworth calendar is regular. It is uniform, with thirteen months of exactly twenty-eight days each. There is a correlation between the day and the date. February eighth will be a Sunday in 1940 and in 2040. Holidays will fall on definite dates. The Cotsworth calendar has the approval of the public. It is efficient. It has been tried. It avoids the inequalities of the Gregorian calendar. Lastly, it is scientific and not a patchwork affair. For these reasons, Ladies and Gentlemen, we propose the immediate adoption of the Cotsworth thirteen-month calendar.

FIRST NEGATIVE

Robert McClurkin, Pittsburgh

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: When the sun and the moon and the earth began to run rings around one another in the heavens, they paid no attention to working out a system of numerical

relationship. Selfishly they didn't consider the inconvenience that they might cause human beings. Consequently the day, the week, the month do not divide evenly into the year. The lunar month is twenty-seven days and a fraction. The year is thirteen lunar months and a fraction. The year is fifty-two weeks and a fraction. The year is three hundred and sixty-five days and a fraction. Thus you can see how difficult it is to construct even a nearly perfect calendar. However, Pope Gregory's astronomers—with some slight assistance from modern astronomers, have given us a calendar as nearly perfect as it is humanly possible to secure. Remember this. So far as measuring the year is concerned, our present calendar is as accurate as any we can have without making extensive alterations in the heavenly scheme. The Cotsworth calendar is no more accurate. Since it is not, it is only in consideration of convenience and kindred matters that we can discover whether we should adopt the Cotsworth calendar or not.

Because they hope that it will save them time and money, some business men have urged the adoption of the Cotsworth calendar. This is a calendar of thirteen months. Each month, having twenty-eight days will consist of exactly four weeks. The extra month which will come between June and July will be called Sol. The thirteen months of twenty-eight days each give three hundred and sixty-four days. The extra day is not a day of the week at all. It is inserted between the Saturday which ends one year and the Sunday which begins the next. The extra day in Leap Year is placed between June and Sol, and called Leap Day since it is not a day of the week either. Such is Cotsworth's plan. It is barely conceivable that such a calendar might have a slight advantage for a few businesses. However, in their fanatical backing of the plan, the accountants and statisticians who imagine it would help them have entirely forgotten that it would cause the rest of us enormous inconvenience.

There's the matter of birthdays. Under the Cotsworth calendar, there are no days of the month after the twenty-eighth. In the Gregorian calendar, about one-twelfth of the days of the year come after the twenty-eighth of the month. About one-twelfth of the people of the world, then, are left without birthdays. Here am I. I was born on the twenty-ninth of March. In Cotsworth's plan, there is no twenty-ninth of March. I would like the Affirmative to answer this question: "Was I born or was I not?"

The holiday dates would be upset. Take, for example, the Fourth of July. We celebrate that date as the day when the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed. But the Cotsworth Calendar would shift dates around so that the Fourth of July would no longer be the right date. After a lengthy struggle with a conversion table, you discover that the Fourth of July is now Sol the seventeenth. Can you imagine yourself getting all steamed up over the Seventeenth of Sol? Do you feel any irresistible urge to go around shouting, "Hurrah for Sol the Seventeenth!" Thus, the Cotsworth Calendar leaves you with a two-horned dilemma with respect to every holiday. Either you celebrate it on a day that doesn't *seem* like the right day, or else you celebrate it on a day that really *isn't* the right day.

These objections, of course, are merely transient. They would only affect the world for two or three generations at the most. Unfortunately we would have to bear the brunt of the inconvenience. However, there is still another inconvenience which would affect the world for a great deal longer.

Since 1752 when the last calendar change occurred, millions of books have been printed using dates under the Gregorian calendar. Before that time there had been very few books. Now there are innumerable history books alone containing millions of dates. If we change our calendar, those dates become inaccurate and consequently worthless. Suppose you are reading a biography. You read, "Lincoln was born on the twelfth of February, 1809." But under the new calendar, the twelfth of February is not the right date. You pull a conversion table from your pocket and after many head-scratchings and much mental effort you discover that Lincoln was born on the fifteenth of February according to Mr. Cotsworth's calendar. You have discovered it, but at the expense of time and trouble. Certainly it would be no easier to use a conversion table every time you run across a date in your reading than it is to use a pocket calendar whenever you aren't sure on what day of the week a given date will fall.

Thus we see that the new calendar would cause us all a great deal of inconvenience. That inconvenience is so great as to counterbalance any little benefit that accountants and statisticians may derive from the proposed calendar. However, there is a still more serious objection to Mr. Cotsworth's notion.

Four great religious organizations have declared themselves to be against the Cotsworth calendar on conscientious grounds.

Seventh Day Adventists, Jews, Mohammedans, and Greek Catholics have refused to accept any such plan. You ask, "Why?" Well, you remember that extra day at the end of the year. In order to make his calendar come out even, Mr. Cotsworth took the extra day and inserted it between the Saturday at the end of the year and the Sunday at the beginning of the next one. That day is not a day of the week at all. It is a blank day, entirely outside the ordinary week. However, it does affect the week in that it makes one week every year, and two in leap year, eight days long. You have Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, *and the blank day*.. That extra day you can celebrate as a religious holiday if you wish. The fact remains, though, that once each year you have a week of eight days against the express command of the Bible and the Koran.

Now we of the Negative don't claim that this objection is sound. It may not be. But no matter what you say or how much you say, the members of those four great religious bodies will continue to object to the Cotsworth calendar because of its annual eight-day week. The seriousness of their objection lies in fact that their membership composes over half the population of the civilized world, the world which would use the proposed calendar. Certainly it would be neither wise, right, nor possible to force on them a calendar to which they have conscientious objections.

It seems particularly foolish to advocate calendar reform when you realize that there is very little agitation for it. Of course there are a great many magazine articles advocating calendar reform and praising Mr. Cotsworth's calendar. However, practically all of those articles are written either by Mr. George Eastman or by people in his employ. Of course there is a National Committee on Calendar Simplification, but George Eastman is chairman of that committee, and he helps to finance it. Propaganda for the Cotsworth calendar is flooding the country, but it all comes from a very, very small body of people composed almost entirely of Mr. Eastman, Mr. Cotsworth himself, and a few business men whom they have interested.

That there is really very little public agitation for calendar reform is evidenced by the League of Nations report. After investigating all of the methods proposed for revising the calendar, they made a report in which they stated that there was so little public interest in a revision of the calendar that nothing

could be done about it at present. And so we see that there is really no widespread demand for a new calendar and that the agitation for one nearly all comes from a few business men.

So far, then, we of the Negative have presented these three objections to the Cotsworth Calendar. It would cause tremendous inconvenience to all of us by upsetting birthdays and holidays and by making useless all dates in books printed under the Gregorian calendar. Four religious bodies, Seventh Day Adventists, Mohammedans, Greek Catholics and Jews, object to it because of the eight-day week which comes once a year and twice on leap year. And there is really very little public demand for a change, most of the agitation coming from Mr. Eastman and his cohorts. These three objections alone are enough to condemn the Cotsworth calendar to the scrap heap.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Edward T. Crowder, Jr., Pittsburgh

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I suppose that whenever something new is proposed one can expect to have it attacked on the grounds that it will be inconvenient and that it will cause a break with tradition. We have been told several things about the present calendar: that as far as measuring time is concerned it is as good as the proposed calendar, that there is no popular demand for a calendar change, that about one-twelfth of the birthdays of the world will be lost, that holidays will lose their flavor, and that a great proportion of the world's population oppose the calendar on religious grounds.

Regarding the statement that the present calendar is adequate for measuring the year, i. e. in its leap-year device, we reply that of course it is. The Cotsworth calendar is a reform of the internal structure of the calendar—the division of the year, not its length.

Mr. Spirer has shown how these difficulties are removed by the Cotsworth calendar with its equal months and its fixity from year to year. The business man no longer has to say to himself that April is longer than February and shorter than March and has one less Saturday than last April. He has mentioned how businesses, realizing the advantage of equal periods, have adopted calendars of their own built on the thirteen-month plan.

Now how about the rest of us. How will we benefit? I have already agreed that there is no popular turmoil about the calendar. We have used the old thing so long that we have become adjusted to it and take its inconveniences for granted. But there are inconveniences just the same. Did someone ever ask you if you could attend a meeting or a dinner on the fifteenth of next month? What did you do? If you had a pocket calendar you may have pulled it out and seen what day of the week it fell on. If not you asked your friend and he said: "I think it's a Monday; let's see, today's the seventeenth, and so on." If he gave up, you waited till you got home and looked it up on the kitchen wall. Did you ever want to visualize for a moment just how the calendar ran for a couple of weeks or so? How do you tell what date next Wednesday falls on? I am in the habit of counting from Mondays, for I can usually remember Monday's date from the theatre bill boards. Some of them are changing shows on Friday now, and it may complicate my calculations. And then, finally, did you ever have your home budget or your pocket-book schedule distorted because payday came irregularly? If they come on Saturdays they may be four in one month and five in the next. If they come on the first and the fifteenth, there's no telling on what day of the week they may fall.

Do these things seem trivial? More trivial than worrying about changing the date of your birthday? To answer this question for yourself, consider the way in which the new calendar would work. Every month is a perfect rectangle just like every other month. It starts on Sunday and ends on Saturday. You learn that Sundays fall on the first, eighth, fifteenth, and twenty-second of the month every month every year. The third is always the first Tuesday of the month, whether it's January or October. There will be regularity of pay-days. Weeks will coincide perfectly with months. There will be no change in the calendar from year to year. We will have achieved a perpetual calendar which is so clear and simple that it can be visualized and used by everyone capable of remembering how the one model four-week month looks on paper.

Now we are told that certain people will object to the new calendar on the grounds that the blank days will interfere with the seven-day cycle of Sabbaths. In fairness to the negative speaker, we must say that he did not claim that the objection was sound or logical—but merely that it would be unjust. That

the continuity of the Sabbaths would be broken once in an ordinary year and twice for Leap year is too obvious a fact to argue. It remains to be seen, however, exactly how many people will hold out on these strictly orthodox grounds. I suppose that one of the purposes of this debate should be to convince the objectors that the Sabbath, as anything else, should be viewed intelligently. The Cotsworth calendar makes it regular; it is now haphazard. But we haven't time for such a debate. We must leave the religious argument by saying that we refuse to believe that God will strenuously object—at least no more than he did when Christians and Jews disagreed on whether the "seventh" day came on Saturday or Sunday.

Of course the dates of the present calendar will be somewhat changed under the new one. A simple little conversion table which a sixth-grade could learn to use in a few minutes shows you what the old date becomes under the new calendar. We have heard the objection that anniversaries and holidays will no longer come on the old dates. There may be some sentimental loss on this account. But I wonder if there would be if people realized how little the date of a holiday means anyway. Are the dates accurate now? George Washington was born on a day that was called February the eleventh. The name was changed to the twenty-second because a number of days were dropped out of the calendar in 1752. Legend tells us that St. Patrick's Day falls on the seventeenth as a compromise between those who thought it came on the eighth and those who insisted that it was the ninth. They combined the two and got seventeen. The date of Christmas is uncertain. Easter, the other great Christian holiday, follows the moon. Thanksgiving moves about like election day. These date associations that we are supposed to have—just what do they amount to? The negative speaker's dilemma about the Fourth of July is easily solved: simply call it Independence Day. Then he can be happy. I have a strong suspicion that when the Fourth comes on Sunday even he waits till Monday to shoot his firecrackers.

It is also objected that the number thirteen is a prime number and cannot be divided by anything. But why divide it? For quarters and half-years? They will not contain whole numbers of months, but they will consist of an exact number of weeks (plus Year Day and Leap Day, of course) and will end at definite times: the first quarter with the first week in April, the second quarter with the second week of Sol, and so on.

There is usually some inconvenience in changing from an old to a new way of doing things. This change will be no exception. However, there will be tables to readjust monthly payments, and appropriate legislation can provide for long time contract dates.

That is the Cotsworth calendar. It is simple. Among its endorsers are Mr. Edwin R. A. Seligman, America's eminent economist, Mr. Carl Snyder, statistician of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the New York State Chamber of Commerce, to name only a few.

To summarize, the case for calendar reform is briefly this. We have noted that the present calendar is a sort of castoff birthday present from the Caesars; that it is proving itself inadequate for modern complex life because of lack of fixity and an irregular structure; that merely from the standpoint of the individual a more simple calendar is desirable. The Cotsworth, or thirteen-month plan, is not perfect, nor can we change without some trouble. We submit the calendar on the basis of its simplicity and convenience, its endorsements, and its proof in the present use of thirteen-period calendars in business organizations. When we get the new calendar we will have something which has much more to recommend it than the fact that it is hard to get rid of.

SECOND NEGATIVE

Samuel Strauss, Pittsburgh

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, GENTLEMEN, AND LISTENERS; if there are any left at this time: The Affirmative seem to deplore the fact that our calendar originated in a rather haphazard manner. Old Julius Caesar, it seems, was suffering from epilepsy when he put thirty-one days in his month; his nephew Augustus was slightly inebriated when he named a month after himself. And then the Affirmative lost all respect for Pope Gregory because he remodeled the calendar and left conditions as bad as ever. But before we go any further, let me remind you that anything worth while does not have to be scientifically worked out in a laboratory. The old Greek, Archimedes, while taking a bath discovered the principle of displacement—a law of physics used by builders of great ships. Yet even Mr. Cotsworth will agree that Archimedes' discovery was of great value.

The same is true of our present calendar. Time has proved its worth. People like and understand it, without the use of conversion tables. The public is satisfied with the exception of a few statisticians and accountants. If George Eastman and the other seventy-nine satisfied users of the thirteen-month idea like Mr. Cotsworth's plan, let them use it. But why for the sake of business bookkeeping alone, should we force such confusion on the public, when Cotsworth's plan will offer no advantage to business, which business cannot now enjoy, if it will.

If this proposal should ever be adopted, it would work a serious disadvantage to the general public. Our civilization for the past two hundred years has been deeply interwoven, with this calendar. We have formed valuable associations and time relationships with it. For example, down in Tennessee where I live, farmers plant their seed around April 1st, outdoor swimming begins around the last of May, and people change their woollens about April 15th. Everywhere we find similar associations. Do not forget that if a new calendar is adopted all of these associations will be lost.

Then let us also remember the countless legal entanglements that little Johnny Public will find himself in if this new calendar is accepted. Existing deeds, contracts, leases, and public records will have to be revised. Think of it! State legislatures would be busy for years ironing out complications that would arise. Nearly all state constitutions today contain restrictions that would prohibit the passage of any law impairing the obligation of contract. This means two calendars at the same time. Leases and contracts would fall due as at present. You might pay bills and receive wages on a thirteen-month plan and have to pay rent on a twelve-month scale. Now what is this act of legislature that Mr. Crowder so casually mentions as a remedy for our objections?

So far in this discussion we have been considering only the disadvantages the Cotsworth calendar will bring to the common man. Now we will go a step further and follow the Affirmative into their own ground. We contend that the inconveniences to business will equal or outweigh the advantages. The number thirteen itself is a tremendously complicated number to work with, when you try to figure interest rates or loan periods. In the first place thirteen is a prime number and is divisible only by one and thirteen itself. All months and combinations of months would become complex fractional parts of the year.

Halves, quarters, and thirds would become $6\frac{1}{2}$, $3\frac{1}{4}$, $4\frac{1}{3}$ months respectively. Quarterly and half year periods would have to begin and end in the middle of the month. Rents would have to be refigured. Businesses that use statistical data would of course lose the benefit of their experience of former years. Comparisons could not be made between a twelve month calendar and a thirteen month scheme. Under the new plan monthly closings would have to be made thirteen times a year, which means additional monthly statements, more work for the auditors, and additional employees for keeping books.

In the case of interest figurings, all of our short-cut computation tables would be useless. For instance, today, if we should want to figure the interest on a hundred and fifty dollars, for two months at six percent, all we do is mark off the last two numbers. A dollar and a half is the answer. But under the new and supposedly simplified calendar, we would first multiply the principal by six percent, divide by three hundred and sixty-five and then multiply by fifty-six. This is Mr. Eastman's idea of calendar simplification.

I wonder if the Gentlemen of the affirmative realize that there will be an added cost in the publication of magazines. Our monthlies will have to be edited thirteen times a year instead of twelve, literally meaning that you will pay extra for the same material that you now get in twelve issues. And who will bear the loss? Any increase in the cost of these items will have to be born by the public.

Let us take another practical example, one that will affect both the public and the statistician. I refer to the case of public utilities. Under the affirmative scheme, public utility companies would be compelled to read meters and render bills thirteen times a year instead of twelve. This is not a small matter, for according to a public utility official who testified before Congress, it would add eight per cent to the overhead. The chief accountant of the gas and light company here in Pittsburgh states that under the proposed calendar approximately a half million extra meter-readings would be necessary each year. Who pays for this? Why the public as usual shares the loss with the gas and light company.

But the proponents of this new calendar loudly proclaim its advantages to business. Let us examine the scheme from the point of view of those businesses which supposedly would profit by it. The Affirmative tell us that under the Cotsworth calendar

you can have accurate monthly and yearly comparisons. What do they mean by accurate? Apparently they forget that holidays will come at irregular intervals on their calendar as well as on our present one. Then what happens to the comparable twenty-eight day month, with twenty-two working days in November and twenty-four in April. Exact monthly comparisons are impossible because of the irregularity with which holidays fall. Accuracy in yearly comparisons is even more impossible because of weather changes, seasonal variations, style changes, the likelihood of substitution and countless other conditions that must enter in. If we want to compare the raincoat sales of April this year with April last, we have to consider possible weather changes, even though both months are identical in number of days. The mere fact that a cow gives two gallons of milk on Washington's birthday this year is no definite proof that she will give two gallons on the same day next year. Statistics, then, at their best are merely facts upon which generalizations and half accurate predictions are made. And since one or two days more or less in any month will not affect the material value of statistics, why bring such confusion to business as well as the public, just to help the statistician add two and two together.

In the few remaining minutes, let us briefly review the case. Our opponents are advocating a scheme relatively simple in theory and outward appearances, but which is very complex and confusing in practice. Eastman, Cotsworth, Marving, Seligman, and a few others are for it. On the other hand the Jews, Mohammedans, Greek Catholics and Seventh Day Adventists are ardently opposed because of the religious objection my colleague has told you about. The opposition proudly tell us that at present there are eighty users of the thirteen-month plan, as though that were reason enough for accepting their proposition. I might at this time inform them that the auditing department of the United States Steel Company conducted an investigation of its own and found that two hundred forty-three concerns had examined the Cotsworth calendar and rejected it. We have also pointed out the confusion that will result from the changing of dates, holidays, birthdays, books, leases, and rents.

Now the Affirmative may be able to clear up a few controverted points in their rebuttal. We want to know specifically how they will meet the religious objection here on earth and not their personal conjectures as to what the Almighty might think of Mr.

Cotsworth's plan if he were listening in. We are also curious to discover either how business or the public will benefit by the increased overhead of public utilities, the extra monthly magazine, the innumerable legal difficulties, or the idealistic accuracy in statistics.

At this point, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Negative closes its case. If we must have calendar reform, let us at least wait until Mr. Cotsworth can devise a plan that will do as much for you and me as he hopes this one will do for the statistician and accountant.

FIRST NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Robert McClurkin, Pittsburgh

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Affirmative began by criticising our present calendar because of its origin. Because of the haphazard way in which it was put together, they say that we should have a new one. They denounce the foibles of the Caesars and the calendar which those Caesars started. Such an objection proves exactly nothing. We are not concerned with its origin at all, but with its present utility. Let's keep the ancients out of this.

After that groundless criticism, they pointed to the irregularities of the present calendar. It seems they are concerned because the statisticians are concerned about the unequal lengths of months and of halves and quarters of the year. We of the Negative fail to see how the proposed calendar would make it any easier for the accountants and statisticians. They would have twenty-eight days every month, no doubt, but they would also have thirteen months. The difficulty that they would have with the prime number, thirteen, would be endless. Moreover, the accountants would still have difficulty comparing the months with each other. So long as there are unequal numbers of holidays in the different months, there will be unequal numbers of working days, and there will be no adequate comparison. November has two legal holidays and April has none. How can you compare the two accurately when the same thing will hold true under the Cotsworth calendar? Apparently the Cotsworth calendar is not going to be an unmixed blessing even to the accountants and statisticians for whom it was primarily devised.

The same affirmative speaker made a very rash assertion. He

told you that because the calendar had already been changed once or twice without very much confusion, it could be changed again now without any more confusion. Since the last calendar change in 1752, the world has changed most radically. In the present state of the world, even business would be put to inconvenience by a calendar change. Accountants' books would have to be shifted from the twelve-month calendar to the thirteen-month calendar. They would be completely baffled if they had to try to compare a month under the thirteen-month calendar with one under the twelve-month calendar as they would have to do if the calendar were changed.

The next speaker for the Affirmative objected to our religious argument. Although he admitted that nothing could be said in answer to it he said, "I refuse to believe that God will strenuously object." I refuse to believe that he had any inside information on the subject. And four great religious organizations will refuse to believe that he knows whether God will object or not. So long as these organizations object to the Cotsworth calendar we certainly should not adopt it, especially since they compose half the population of the civilized world.

Against the Cotsworth calendar we of the Negative have advanced some very definite objections. First, it would cause us all tremendous inconvenience. It would upset holidays and birthdays. It would force us to use conversion tables every time we ran across a date in a book printed before the change to the new calendar was made. Cotsworth's proposal, then, would bring with it a great deal of inconvenience. Second, Protestants, Mohammedans, Greek Catholics and Jews object to the Calendar because of that week every year which has eight days instead of seven. Third, there is no wide-spread agitation for calendar reform, and most of the propaganda favoring it emanates from Eastman and his cohorts. Fourth, the public does not profit economically. In the case of public utilities, especially, overhead costs and costs to the public would rise eight per cent with the introduction of the new calendar. Fifth, business would not profit so greatly after all. Accurate comparisons, insofar as they are ever anywhere near accurate, would still be impossible because of the varying numbers of holidays in the months. These five disadvantages the Cotsworth calendar must inevitably have, and we believe that they more than balance any advantages that it would bring.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Jess Spirer, Pittsburgh

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Negative, this evening, are worried about many matters that cannot be considered of major importance. There's the matter of when to change woolens if we change the calendar—a rather fuzzy argument at best.

The Negative tell us that some of the religious peoples of the world will object to a change of calendar. Now we must remember that a great mass of religionists who might object to a change in the Gregorian calendar do not use the Gregorian calendar at all. A tremendous number of Mohammedans in the orient, mentioned by the first speaker of the Negative, at present are not even using the Gregorian calendar. And then, let us not be too certain that the orthodox churches will protest as vigorously as Mr. McClurkin prophesies. Listen to the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Eastern Orthodox Church:

The Orthodox Church, although it would prefer a calendar preserving the continuity of the week, is not bound by this view should the other Churches agree to accept a new calendar entailing the interruption of the continuity of the week.

The Federation of Swiss Protestant Churches says:

It (the Council of the Church) would not be opposed to a day outside the calendar at the end of the year (December 31).

The Christian Science Board of directors says it is "quite indifferent as to the method of reforming the calendar" since the church recognizes no distinctly religious holidays except Sunday. The Committee of the League of Nations which investigated the matter of calendar reform says:

From the point of view of dogma, strictly speaking, . . . reform of the Gregorian Calendar does not meet with difficulties of such a nature that they could be regarded beforehand as insuperable.

Mr. McClurkin says that religious organizations oppose interfering with the seven-day cycle by inserting a year day between December 28 and January 1. Remember, please, that the Cotsworth calendar interferes in no way with the spirit of Sabbath observance. And remember, too, please, that Moses, the original

Moses, certainly patriarchal enough for the gentlemen of the Negative, employed the principle incorporated in the Cotsworth calendar when he inserted an extra Sabbath at Pentecost, making the arrangement: Sunday, Pentecost, Monday. To make the prediction that many religious people will object to the Cotsworth calendar when they realize the harmlessness of a slight change is rather speculative.

Mr. Strauss treats statistics rather gleefully. No one values statistics, he remarks. He should recall that great business houses rely upon the findings of their statisticians for every important move made in their policies. If a cow gives two gallons of milk on Washington's Birthday this year there is no certainty that she, the same cow, will give two gallons of milk on next Washington's Birthday. That's true enough. But if the owner of the cow keeps statistics accurately, he will know whether he wants milk or beef for the rest of the summer.

Another worry of the Negative is that with a thirteen-month calendar we shall have an extra issue of periodicals. In the matter of magazines, many are issued on a weekly or quarterly basis, so there will be no trouble there. For the monthly magazines, if they are worth printing twelve times a year, certainly there will be no great loss in issuing an additional number.

Another matter not too compelling, the matter of Mr. McClurkin's birth, must be considered, I suppose. He is the best authority. Let his conscience be his guide.

The Cotsworth calendar offers us a way out of the inconveniences of our present Gregorian calendar. Many business houses have long recognized this. The public, in general, is beginning to realize it. In the report of the National Committee on Calendar Simplifications for the United States, just issued, you will find a colossal number of organizations which approve the thirteen-month plan. In the list of endorsements printed there you will find organizations from the National Academy of Sciences to the Dancing Masters of America, from the American Association of University Professors to the National Warm Air Heating Association. Even the Greeting Card Association favors the simplification that a thirteen-month plan will bring.

Let us forget these traditional objections that are made to any progressive step. Let us agree that a change to a thirteen-month plan will be slightly inconvenient at first. A change of

any kind is slightly inconvenient when first made. It's slightly inconvenient to change a soiled collar for a clean one. A little difficulty, and then a scientific calendar, a convenient calendar, a calendar with months of even length, regular pay days, and correlated days and dates. Adopt the Cotsworth calendar!

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL

Samuel Strauss, Pittsburgh

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: If you have listened to everything the Affirmative has said this evening. I am afraid that you may be in doubt as to whether we need a simpler calendar, or more intelligent statisticians to use the present one. The first false impression that you might have gathered from this discussion, is that we of the Negative are the only opposers of Cotsworth's plan. But let me assure you that this is wrong. After investigating other sources than Mr. Eastman's book on calendar reform, we find that there is no popular demand for calendar change. Several national committees have been selected to aid in the spread of propaganda. But in most instances the committees in this country were financially and morally inspired by the Kodak magnate. In no case, however, has this government or any other government felt it desirable to cooperate officially with Mr. Cotsworth in his movement. The League of Nations, as the Affirmative has told you, investigated this plan along with one hundred eighty-five others, and selected a thirteen-month scheme as being the least unpopular. But according to a report of the League's findings, there is not enough public demand for a change at this time. So Mr. Eastman in reality cries alone for reform.

The gentlemen point with pride to the miracles that have come about in those eighty large concerns who are using the thirteen-month calendars at the present time. I think that a very good reason for *not* adopting the scheme. If the firms who like the new calendar can get its benefits, while the rest of the world exists more contentedly under the old one, why adopt it? Furthermore, the fact that a thirteen-month calendar works to perfection in the woolen industry is not an indication that it will be useful in the herring business. There are many concerns that would be seriously inconvenienced by a thirteen-month

calendar. All public utilities, all magazine publishers, and our largest steel manufacturers, along with many others, could not possibly benefit. Even their statisticians would lose. And, as I pointed out before, two hundred and forty-three institutions examined the plan and discarded it. Among these were the United States Steel Company, Bethlehem Steel, Missouri and Pacific Railroad, National Bank of Commerce and the Duquesne Light Company. So again I reiterate, do not for the sake of a few adopt a scheme that will bring no additional advantages to that minority, and will bring confusion to the greatest number.

Now how has the religious objection been answered? Will they again tell us that they don't think the Almighty will seriously object. But we don't care what the Affirmative thinks. The fact remains that whether the religious objection is sound or unsound; there are millions of ardent religionists who will not tolerate having the continuity of the weekly cycle broken. We have listed four great religious denominations who have gone on record as being definitely opposed to the Cotsworth calendar, and the gentlemen of the Affirmative have not named us one group who favor it. If the religious bodies are to be considered, then for their sake alone we should reject this absurd plan.

Mr. Crowder seemed all aroused over the hoped for advantages that this fantastic proposal would bring to the individual. Well what are these advantages? First and last it gives him a perpetual calendar with fixed dates. And for the sake of this questionable advantage, the individual would perpetually pay a higher gas bill, perpetually he will pay for the extra month's magazine and perpetually he will be involved in legal entanglements. Dissatisfaction then is the price the individual must pay for knowing that the 1st, 8th, 15th and 22nd of every month are Sundays. If Johnny Smith is too disinterested to look up his appointments on a calendar he certainly is too lazy to keep them.

Now the chief advocates of the Cotsworth calendar along with the less significant ones have cried aloud the convenience that would accrue to the statistician in his monthly comparisons. Business would benefit. But how? Mr. Spirer of the Affirmative says: "A business man cannot compare one month's business with another, for the simple reason that the months are unequal in length." We concede that this is the *simple* reason,

but the more complex reasons are that the weather varies from month to month, the styles change, and popular taste is not constant. These are the causes of inexact comparisons on our old calendar or any other calendar. Regardless of the exactness of statistics, the comparisons remain generalizations. They indicate mere tendencies, and one or two days more in any month will not sufficiently improve comparisons to warrant such a change.

The first affirmative speaker referred to the Cotsworth calendar as a scientific arrangement. And ever since he made that statement I have tried to find out what's scientific about it. The week and the month on the Cotsworth calendar have no more scientific significance than do the same units on the Gregorian calendar. Both intervals are arbitrarily fixed. The difference between the Affirmative and ourselves is that our calendar is unscientific and we know it, while the Cotsworth plan is just as unscientific but they have to be told about it in public.

In the final analysis then we see the Cotsworth calendar as a scheme designed primarily for the benefit of a few accountants. It will not help all, and all do not want it. Those few who like the plan can use it while we stick to the old one. Mr. Spirer by proclaiming the fixity of this proposal has tried to divert your attention from the inevitably higher gas and light bills from the cost of the extra month's magazine, the legal entanglements, and the confusion involved in the changing of all dates. This new calendar while perhaps simple in theory will bring untold confusion into all forms of life. Associations will be lost, interest figurings will have to be changed and you arouse the antagonism of several important religious bodies. Before closing I again remind you that only eighty concerns in this country are in favor of the new plan while two hundred forty-three are against it, and while no religious body is in favor, four denominations have expressed themselves as opposed.

We believe then that George Eastman would render a better service to society by devoting his millions to the founding of homes for feeble-minded statisticians instead of trying to afflict the world with Moses Cotsworth's day dream.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

Edward T. Crowder, Jr., Pittsburgh

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The debate is almost over. Now is the time to try to gather up loose ends and find some order in this jumble of arguments.

The Affirmative has tried to show you what an irregular haphazard thing our present calendar is, how it confuses business men by distorting comparisons and how it confuses those who have to meet monthly payments sometimes from four weekly paydays and sometimes from five. We have also tried to show how, in a social way, the calendar is confusing to everyone, in that it is seldom clearly in our minds. We cannot visualize our months in advance or tell two weeks ahead of time on what day of the week a given date will fall.

We have explained the Cotsworth, or International Fixed Calendar, and we have shown that it gives us three important features: (1) equality of the months; (2) the perfect fitting together of weeks and months; (3) and fixity from year to year. We have pointed out how these features meet the difficulties which we now experience with our calendar. In business the variation of months both in length and in the business value of the week days that they contain is greatly reduced. The gentlemen of the Negative have objected that the claimed advantage of the new calendar to business is an illusion. Listen to Mr. L. J. Stewart, Comptroller of the Western Clock Co., which has used a thirteen-period calendar in its business for thirty-seven years: "Its chief advantage is that it facilitates the presentation of comparative reports. Numbered among its benefits (the benefits of the fixed calendar) are more accurate cost and production records because of the greater ease and accuracy with which production can be scheduled, absence of split payrolls, more effective planning of clerical work in closing the books. In our experience it has saved an immense amount of time." We repeat that if eighty concerns can use a thirteen-period plan in the midst of a twelve-month civilization, the advantages to business are rather tangible.

There is little more to be said about religion. The Sabbath objection, I think we all agree, is unreasonable. To the argument that many people will balk there is only one answer. And that is to question how many actually will. The Eastern Ortho-

dox Church has declared itself willing to accept the blank day if the other churches do. Aside from this we can only hope that these people will soon see the light.

Then there is the loss of birthdays. An unimaginative person might lose his birthday forever in the change. This evil will be at least partly offset by some women's real willingness to lose them. A normally intelligent person should find little difficulty in using a conversion table. I am assuming and hoping that the Herculean effort our opponent speaks of is a speculation, not an actual experience.

Of course there will be inconvenience in changing although it doesn't take a lifetime to become adjusted to a new date for planting corn. Here is the position of the Affirmative: Perhaps we could worry along for centuries, even forever, under the present calendar as Augustus tossed it to us, even though certain business men have found it inconvenient and have discarded it. But if we do not want to be repeating "Thirty days hath September" in the year 5030 A. D. then we had better make up our minds to experience at some time the inconvenience of calendar reform. If we are waiting for a better plan, then we invite you to sit down and try to figure out a plan which gives us a better arrangement than the Cotsworth plan of perpetual, equal, simple, four-week months.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE COTSWORTH THIRTEEN MONTH CALENDAR

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Eastman Kodak Company. Business Library. Calendar reform, 1926-April, 1927. 6p. typew. The Company. Rochester. '28.
- Johnson, J. E. comp. Thirteen-month calendar. (Reference Shelf. vol. VI. no. 4) p.33-46. H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. '29.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Alphabetical list of typical endorsers of the Cotsworth international fixed calendar plan to simplify the calendar, as advocated by George Eastman. 31p. pa. Eastman Kodak Company. Rochester. '27.
- American Art Works. History of the calendar. 8p. pa. gratis. American Art Works, inc. Coshocton, Ohio.
- Bacon, A. S. Original calendar of thirteen months of twenty-eight days each. 25p. 25c. rev. by S. W. Gamble. 3449 E. State St. Long Beach, Cal. '28.
- Cotsworth, Moses B. Fixed "yearal" proposed to replace changing almanaks. 117p. International Almanak Reform League New Westminster, B. C. Canada. '14.
- Couzens, R. C. Stories of the months and days. \$2. Stokes. N.Y. '23.
- Eastman, George. Calendar simplification. 32p. The Author. 343 State St. Rochester.
- Eastman, George. Do we need calendar reform? 66p. Eastman Kodak Company. Rochester. '27.
- Eastman, George. Present calendar: defects and their remedy. 7p. mim. The Author. 343 State St. Rochester. F. 23, '28.
- Gamble, S. W. Bacon-Gamble ancient and modern fixed date calendars. 16p. 25c. The Author. 3449 E. State St. Long Beach, Cal. '28.

- Gamble, S. W. Most important national, international, civil and religious calendar. 2p. mim. The Author. 3449 E. State St. Long Beach, Cal.
- Hooke, S. H. New Year's Day; the story of the calendar. 96p. \$1. William Morrow. N.Y. '28.
- International Chamber of Commerce. Calendar reform. pa. gratis. International Chamber of Commerce. 1615 H St. N. W. Wash. D.C. '21.
- Johnsen, Julia E. Thirteen-month calendar. (Reference Shelf VI. no. 4) 201p. 90c. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '29.
- League of Nations. Secretariat. Information section. League of Nations and the reform of the calendar. 15c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '28.
- League of Nations. Special committee of enquiring into the reform of the calendar. Classification and summary of proposals for calendar reform received before July 1, 1926. pa. 40c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '27.
- National Committee on Calendar Simplification. Question of the calendar. 4p. P. O. Box 1822, Wash. D.C. '29.
- National Committee on Calendar Simplification for the United States. Report submitted to the Secretary of State, Washington, August 1929. 199p. pa. gratis. The Committee. 343 State St. Rochester. '29.
- Nichol, F. D. Story of a lost day. 96p. pa. 25c. Pacific Press. Mountain View, Cal. '30.
- Philip, Alexander. Calendar: its history, structure and improvement. 104p. Cambridge Univ. Press. Cambridge. '21.
- Philip, Alexander. Improvement of the Gregorian calendar. 30p. E. P. Dutton. N.Y. '18.
- Savage, G. C. Cycles of time and seasons. vii, 203p. \$2.50. Baptist Sunday School Board. Nashville, Tenn. '28.
- Stewart, L. J. and others. Operating a thirteen month work calendar. (Financial executives series no. 26) 40p. pa. \$1. American Management Assn. 20 Vesey St. N.Y. '28.
- United States. Chamber of Commerce. Calendar reform. 19p. The Chamber. Wash. D.C. '29.

PERIODICALS

- Advocate of Peace. 91:241-5. Ap. '29. Calendar reform and world peace. M. N. Stiles.

- American Accountant. 15:60-2. F. '30. Details of thirteen-period calendar adopted by mail order firm (Sears, Roebuck and Co.)
- American Bankers Association Journal. 21:631+. Ja. '29. Shall we change the calendar? G. E. Roberts.
- Astronomical Society of the Pacific. 31:150-7. Je. '19. Shall we reform the calendar? W. W. Campbell.
- Atlantic Monthly. 137:10-22. Ja. '26. Joints of time. C. D. Stewart.
- Baltimore. p. 33-4. N. '29. Calendar reform halted for the time being.
- Boston Business. 20:14+. F. '29. Shall simplification be applied to the calendar? F. E. Kunkel.
- Bradstreet's. 57:847. D. 28, '29. Thirteen-month calendar to be used by Sears, Roebuck and Co. R. E. Wood.
- Bulletin of the Pan American Union. 54:543-70. Je. '22. Evolution of calendars and how to improve them. Moses B. Cotsworth.
- Bulletin of the Pan American Union. 61:655-66. Jl. '27. Importance of calendar reform to the business world. George Eastman.
- Bulletin of the Pan American Union. 62:1234-42. D. '28. Progress toward calendar simplification. il. I. K. Macdermott.
- Bulletin of the Pan American Union. 63:589-90. Je. '29. Peruvian calendar reform committee.
- Bureau Farmer (Texas edition). 3:15. Ag. '28. Thirteen month calendar urged for simplicity.
- Business Week. p. 32. Mr. 12, '30. Business could profit by using a natural business year.
- Catholic World. 119:255-7. My. '24. Proposed reform of the Gregorian calendar.
- Chain Store Age. p. 33-4+. Ja. '30. Advantages we have found in the 13-month calendar: chain store organizations in particular should find great benefits in the use of the thirteen-month year, especially as it simplifies accounting and sales analysis. Paul Moore.
- China Weekly Review. 47:79-80. D. 15, '28. China and the Gregorian calendar.
- City Manager Magazine. 8:25-7. Ag. '26. Efficiency hits Father Time. George Eastman.

- Commerce and Finance. 15:1266. Je. 30, '26. How to put thirteen months in the year and twenty-five hours in the day. T. H. Price.
- Commerce and Finance. 15:2427. D. 1, '26. Why not an up-to-date calendar?
- Commercial Holland. 2:29-32. Mr. '20. Practical advantages of calendar reform. Alexander Philips.
- Congressional Digest. 8:97-123. Ap. '29. Should we have a thirteen month year? History of the calendar, provisions of the Porter resolution, and pro and con discussions.
- Congressional Digest. 8:104-5. Ap. '29. Proposed thirteen month calendar. Moses B. Cotsworth.
- Congressional Digest. 8:112-15. Ap. '29. Should the calendar be changed? George Eastman.
- Cornhill Magazine. 62:578-85. My. '27. Reform of the calendar. James Legard.
- Credit Monthly. 31:2. N. '29. Thirteen-month year?
- Current History Magazine of the New York Times. 15:938-9. Mr. '22. Simplifying the calendar. F. A. Blanchard.
- Current Opinion. 66:398-9. Je. '19. To reform the calendar and save \$50,000,000 a year.
- Ecclesiastical Review. 62:1-12. Ja. '20. Simplification of the calendar. Luchsius Semler.
- Ecclesiastical Review. 80:337-43. Ap. '29. New date for Easter. F. A. Tondorf.
- Factory and Industrial Management. 77:469-70. Mr. '29. Production geared to the thirteen-month calendar. L. J. Stewart.
- Forbes. 25:30+. Ja. 15, '30. Why change the calendar? K. Gray.
- Forum. 84:14-22. Jl. '30. Thirteen-month calendar; a debate. George Eastman; F. D. Nichol.
- Governmental Research Association. Proceedings. 1929:116-21. Calendar simplification and municipal administration; with discussion. M. N. Stiles.
- Harvard Business Review. 8:218-26. Ja. '30. Thirteen-month calendar. M. B. Folsom.
- Homiletic Review. 96:129-30. Ag. '28. Simplified calendar. S. L. Gulick.
- Illinois Municipal Review. 7:304-7. N. '28. Simplifying the calendar: a discussion of the use of the thirteen-month calendar and the promotion of its general adoption and usage. F. W. Keough.

- Independent. 98:394-6. Je. 14, '19. Liberty calendar.
- Industrial Digest. 7:16-17. Ag. '28. How does last month compare—if you know? M. B. Folsom.
- Industrial Education Magazine. 32:47-9. Ag. '30. Origin of the calendar. J. A. Donnelly.
- Iron Age. 121:1249-50. My. 3, '28. Advantages and disadvantages of the thirteen-month calendar. M. B. Folsom.
- Journal of Accountancy. 43:161-70. Mr. '27. Interest of the accountant in calendar reform. H. C. Freeman.
- Journal of Geography. 16:1-7. S. '17. Calendar reform. Frederick Homburg.
- Journal of Geography. 29:148-54. Ap. '30. Geographic significance of calendar changes. G. E. Harding.
- League of Nations Official Journal. 7:797-807. Je. '26. Enquiry concerning the advisability of fixing the festival of Easter. Circular letter from the Secretary-General. Replies from governments.
- League of Nations Official Journal. 7:1192. S. '26. Reform of the calendar; resolutions adopted by the committee on communications and transit.
- Literary Digest. 79:51-4. O. 27, '23. Caesar's time lost forever.
- Literary Digest. 79:32. D. 22, '23. End of the Julian calendar.
- Literary Digest. 82:56-7. Ag. 2, '24. Wanted, a new calendar.
- Literary Digest. 94:23. S. 3, '27. Days without dates.
- Literary Digest. 104:60. Ja. 4, '30. Thirteen-month calendar's appeal to business.
- Literary Digest. 104:14. F. 1, '30. Fight for calendar reform.
- Living Age. 270:183-4. Jl. 15, '11. Calendar reform.
- London Chamber of Commerce Journal. 52:385-6. N. 5, '26. Reform of the calendar: should the year consist of twelve or thirteen months?
- Magazine of Business. 53:52-3. Ja. '28. Do we need another calendar reform?
- Manufacturers News. 35:33+. Je. '29. Practical experience with the thirteen-month calendar; with discussion. L. J. Stewart.
- Manufacturers Record. 94:65. Jl. 19, '28. Adjusting the calendar to modern needs. M. B. Folsom.
- Mentor. 16:67. Jl. '28. Our present calendar and the proposed new international fixed calendar.

- Mentor. 16:68. Jl. '28. What about a new calendar? W. D. Moffat.
- Monthly Labor Review. 29:815-18. O. '29. Report of the National committee on calendar simplification, and labor's interest therein.
- Municipal Review of Canada. 25:408-11. O. '29. Changing the calendar. M. N. Stiles.
- Nation. 116:460. Ap. 18, '23. Follies of the Caesars.
- Nation. 129:343-4. O. 2, '29. Reforming the calendar.
- National Academy of Sciences. Proceedings. 6:393-5. Je. '20. Report of the Committee on the reform of the calendar.
- National Education Association Journal. 17:141-2. My. '28. Simplified calendar and the schools. T. E. Finegan.
- Nation's Business. 12:25-6. Je. 5, '24. Why not a common-sense calendar? Edward Prizer.
- Nation's Business. 14:42, 46. My. '26. Importance of calendar reform to the business world. George Eastman.
- Nature. 107:235. Ap. 21, '21. Calendar reform. Alexander Philips.
- Nature. 111:289-90. Mr. 3, '23. Calendar reform. L. C. W. Bonacina.
- Nature. 116:695. N. 7, '25. Improving the Gregorian calendar.
- Nature Magazine. 14:19-22. Jl. '29. Backgrounds of the calendar; how men learned to keep track of fleeting days. C. F. Talman.
- Nature Magazine. 14:92-5. Ag. '29. Debunking the calendar; will the thirteen-month plan do it? E. L. Palmer.
- New Republic. 45:190-1. Ja. 6, '26. Twenty days hath September. Robert Littell.
- New Republic. 47:257. Jl. 21, '26. Rational calendar. D. J. Tinnes.
- Nineteenth Century and After. 193:453-67. Ap. '28. Prayer book calendar. W. H. Hutton.
- North American Review. 227:178-84. F. '29. Chains for the years. Samuel Grafton.
- North Dakota University. Quarterly Journal. 17:36-50. N. '26. Revising the world's time table. D. J. Tinnes.
- Office Economist. 10:10+. Ja. '28. Shall we have a new calendar to suit modern business conditions? F. E. Kunkel.
- Oil, Paint and Drug Reporter. 116:23+. O. 30, '29. Calendar simplification. P. H. Wilson.

- Outlook and Independent. 147:109-12. S. 28, '27. Shall we scrap our calendar? E. H. Abbott.
- Outlook and Independent. 147:178-80. O. 12, '27. Fixed calendar at work; Fuller Brush Company calendar. D. L. Merritt.
- Overland Monthly. 87:5. Ja. '29. January: open gate of the year. A. W. Daugherty.
- Paper Trade Journal. 88:61-3. Ja. 24, '29. Revision of the present calendar badly needed. M. B. Folsom.
- Paper Trade Journal. 88:71-2. Mr. 28, '29. International fixed calendar—what it is and why we want it. S. L. Bush.
- Popular Astronomy. 26:426-7. Je. '18. Proposed change in the calendar.
- Popular Astronomy. 27:335-8. My. '19. Reform of the calendar. H. Deslandres.
- Popular Astronomy. 27:637-46; 28:18-32. D. '19; Ja. '20. Reform of the Julian calendar. Roscoe Lamont.
- Popular Astronomy. 28:557-8. N. '20. Reform of the calendar. Thorwald Kornerup.
- Popular Astronomy. 31:298-308. My. '23. Leap year rules and calendar accuracy. C. F. Marvin.
- Popular Astronomy. 32:129-33. Mr. '24. Reform of the present calendar begun. W. F. Rigge.
- Popular Astronomy. 32:407-11. Ag. '24. New calendar of the Eastern churches. M. N. Shields.
- Popular Astronomy. 32:416-17. Ag. '24. Reform of the present calendar. H. Jameson.
- Popular Astronomy. 33:511-14. O. '25. Second stage in the reform of the present calendar. W. F. Rigge.
- Printer's Ink. 140:17-19. S. 22, '27. I agree with George Eastman; advertising men will have to do something about this trouble with the calendar. Amos Bradbury.
- Printers' Ink. 141:200. O. 20, '27. Thirteen-month calendar will need advertising. E. D. Chase.
- Printers' Ink. 144:76. Jl. 19, '28. Calendar reform movement gathers speed.
- Printers' Ink. 151:41-2+. Ap. 3, '30. Thirteen month calendar.
- Railway Age. 86:242. Ja. 26, '29. Calendar revision favored from statistical standpoint. M. O. Lorenz.

- Refrigerating Engineer. 16:182-3. D. '28. Calendar simplification.
- Review of Reviews. 59:428-9. Ap. '19. Calendar reform and the Peace conference.
- Review of Reviews. 79:126-8. F. '29. Shuffling the calendar.
- Royal Statistical Society Journal. 88:489-512. Jl. '25. Week or month as an intermediate time-unit for statistical purposes; with discussion. Napier Shaw.
- St. Nicholas. 55:207-10. Ja. '28. Last of the calendar makers. H. S. Huntington.
- Saturday Evening Post. 198:22. Ja. 23, '26. Thirty days hath September.
- Saturday Evening Post. 200:31. Mr. 10, '28. When thirteen months make a year. George Eastman.
- School and Society. 30:258-9. Ag. 24, '29. Report of the National committee on calendar simplification.
- School Science and Mathematics. 28:168-71. F. '28. Our calendar. C. N. Mills.
- Science. 47:375-7. Ap. 19, '18. Common-sense calendar. H. C. Warren.
- Science. 47:439-40. My. 3, '18. Reform of the world's calendar. T. G. Dabney.
- Science. 58:sup. 10. S. 28, '23. Julian calendar.
- Science. 60:sup. 14. O. 17, '24. Reform of the calendar.
- Science. 61:286. Mr. 13, '25. Perpetual calendar. A. L. Candy.
- Science. 69:sup. 10-12. Ja. 4, '29. Thirteen-month calendar.
- Science. 69:sup. 10. My. 10, '29. New calendar in Congress.
- Science. 71: sup. 12. Ja. 17, '30. Calendar reform.
- Science. 71:143-5. F. 7, '30. Resolution on calendar reform.
- Scientific American. 81:sup. 122-3. F. 19, '16. Simplex calendar. J. C. Robertson.
- Scientific American. 133:312-13. N. '25. Amazingly accurate calendar system of the Maya Indians. J. C. Bardin.
- Scientific American. 142:349. My. '30. Calendar reform favored by the council and executive committee of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Society of Industrial Engineers Bulletin. p. 19-23. Ja. '30. Calendar reform: a plea for simplification. E. V. Neubauer.
- Toronto Board of Trade Journal. p. 12. Mr. '30. Calendar reform in actual practice.

- Trans-Pacific. 17:4. My. 23, '29. Calendar reform. R. F. Malabar.
- Union Signal. 54:181. Mr. 24, '28. Woman's interest in the simplified calendar. F. W. Keough.
- United States Daily. 4:502. My. 1, '29. Resolution proposes world conference to revise the calendar.
- Virginia Teacher. 10:243-7. O. '29. Our calendar. R. C. Dingledine.
- Women's Wear Daily. Sec. 1. p. 5+. D. 27, '29. New thirteen-month calendar adopted by Sears, Roebuck and Company begins January 2 (1930).
- World Review. 3:216-17. Ja. 10, '27. New world calendar? T. L. Masson.
- World Trade. 2:50-3. Ja. '30. Fixed Easter. Lord Desborough.
- World's Work. 57:132. D. '28. Thirteen-month year?

CHAPTER IX

ORIENTAL VERSUS WESTERN CIVILIZATION

CHINESE DEBATING COUNCIL OF
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

versus

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

QUESTION: *Which civilization seems most likely to bring real happiness to mankind?*

This is a stenographic report of a symposium conducted by representatives of the contrasting cultures, before a Cleveland audience principally composed of the two races whose contributions to civilization were being evaluated. Mr. Victor K. Kwong and Mr. Peter K. Kiang, the Chinese speakers, were graduates of Harvard University, on their way to Hongkong, China, there to begin careers. The discussion was one of fifty, sponsored by Western Reserve University, before Cleveland audiences from October, 1929, to May, 1930. A description of the method and procedure usually followed in these debates and addresses will be found in the *University Debater's Annual* for 1925-1926, page 341.

This particular symposium was held before Criterion Lodge of the Knights of Pythias, Cleveland, March 31, 1930, Mr. Ralph A. Colbert of Western Reserve University presiding. The students were permitted to develop individual ideas and disagree with colleagues or agree with opponents just as they wished. It is interesting to note the vigorous reactions of the audience after the debate under such circumstances. By shift of opinion, the audience considered Western civilization superior to that of the East in a ratio of two to one. Those who did not vote or whose opinion remained unchanged have no part in the final totals. For the report of this debate and the bibliography acknowledgment is hereby made to Professor H. S. Woodward and W. A. D. Millson, of the Department of Speech, Western Reserve University.

BRIEF

ORIENTAL VERSUS WESTERN CIVILIZATION

ARGUMENTS FOR CHINESE CIVILIZATION

INTRODUCTION:

- A. The Chinese make no claim to be a superior race.
 - 1. They are just one race out of many.
 - a. There may be other races as good.
- B. The Chinese do not wish to dominate any other race.
 - 1. They want to live their own way and leave other races free to live as they please.
- I. The American is too materialistic in his conception of the important things in life.
 - A. The average American and his wife are happy only when they have acquired some material thing.
 - 1. Like a radio, a new dress, or a trip to Europe.
 - 2. This happiness is evanescent.
 - a. It wears off with the thrill of having acquired a new thing.
 - (1) Then the American is unhappy until he can acquire another new thing.
 - b. The American cannot be happy as long as there are material things to possess.
 - (1) This will always be the case due to the constant invention and discovery of new things.
 - B. Money is the criterion of success in America.
 - 1. People are classified according to the amount of money they have or earn.
 - a. Like so many automobiles, according to price.
- II. The Chinese philosophy of life stresses spiritual rather than material values.
 - A. Permanent happiness depends upon recognizing the spiritual values of life rather than the materialistic.

1. Granted the basic necessities of food, clothes and shelter, a man should live his life in as rich a manner as possible from the spiritual point of view.
 - a. He should not spend all his life building up a bank account.
 2. This is where Chinese are happier altho they are not so wealthy.
- B. America is a nation of business men only—dedicated only to the “pursuit of happiness.”
1. They do not know real happiness.
 - a. There is one divorce for every five marriages.
 - (1) In China people get married with the determination to appreciate each other and make the best out of life they can.
 - (2) Americans are out for a thrill and when the thrill stops, marriage ceases.
 - (3) The Chinese learn to control their desires, not to indulge them.
 - b. There is great social unrest among the younger generation.
 - (1) Again, they are speeding “on their way” merely for the sake of a new thrill.
 - c. Human values are non-existent in the big apartment houses.
 - (1) No one knows his neighbor.
 - d. The young people leave their parents and often go far away to make their own future.
 - (1) In China, sons and daughters stay with and care for their parents, and try to make them happy.
- III. The Chinese philosophy of life is preferable to the American for other reasons.
- A. Living in China is an art.
1. The Chinese try to evaluate the different sides of their daily life.
 - a. In America, on the contrary, there is mainly collective activity.
 - (1) The whole mass of people are hustling and bustling thru life all the day long.
 - (2) This produces mob action, every body doing the same thing.

- (a) The Chinese, on the contrary, live quietly, engaged in different things according to their circumstances and individual desires.
- B. Happiness to the Chinese is the satisfaction of what one has.
 - 1. They live in hope, in spite of famines and civil war.
 - a. These are temporary things caused by some outward uncontrolled circumstances.
 - (1) They are not taught by the Chinese philosophy.
 - 2. Western civilization has not succeeded in bringing much happiness to China.
 - a. It has contributed schools and hospitals but also things like mortality, concessions, treaties, gunboats, and marines parading the streets.
 - 3. Chinese homes are happier than American homes.
 - a. The wife considers home making not only a problem but also a duty.
 - b. The home is organized on a family basis.
 - 4. Chinese girls are happier than American girls.
 - a. They find satisfaction in keeping their finer qualities.
 - (1) American girls are controlled by artificial standards.
 - b. The relationship between the sexes is a more normal one.
 - (1) In America because of the unbalanced relationship the men are tired and the women restless.
 - 5. Missionaries generally love China and are loathe to leave it.
 - a. They find a place in which really to enjoy themselves.

ARGUMENTS FOR WESTERN CIVILIZATION

- I. America has prospered from the beginning, in spite of continued prophecy to the contrary.
 - A. America was born as a colony of an imperialistic monarchy.
 - 1. European historical and political sages were amazed when she declared the right to be free.

- B. They had little faith in her assertion of every man's inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.
 - C. Later, when our nation prospered, they predicted ruin in ten, twenty, thirty, then fifty years.
 - 1. Still nothing happened.
 - D. They hailed the division of this country by the Civil War as the end of democracy.
 - 1. The division was healed and still America prospered.
 - E. With the World War our country became the most prosperous in the world.
 - 1. The critics found developing in America a kind of culture.
 - a. The people seemed to be happy.
- II. America's system of mass production is resulting in increased happiness for all the people.
- A. The criticism that it leads to mechanized thought and thus to unhappiness has proved unfounded.
 - B. It has not proved to be true that America is losing her culture and is unable to appreciate the spiritual values of life.
 - 1. Dr. Hu Shih, looking over our American system, said that the western mastery of matter is true spirituality.
 - a. He says that the masses of Europe and the United States are freer, happier, and safer than those of Asia, because of materialism.
- III. The spiritual conception of life described by the Chinese is enjoyed by only a very small group of the Chinese people.
- A. China delights in the beauties of learning for its own sake but makes no practical application of them to life.
 - B. There are in China two groups of people.
 - 1. The remains of the old aristocratic order, numbering about 960,000 people.
 - a. They are the people who have the time and the economic means to enjoy this way of life.
 - 2. The second group is the mass of the people, about 449,000,000 souls.
 - a. They are famine stricken.

- (1) Two independent investigations disclosed an average of one famine a year since 191 A.D.
 - (a) One famine alone took 30,000,000 lives.
 - (b) Mr. Mallory, in *China, Land of Famine*, attributes as the causes of famines, ancestor worship, high birth rate, early marriages, burial customs, waste of time, and the conservatism of the people.
- b. They are poverty stricken.
 - (1) They are common laborers, often working twelve or more hours a day.
 - (2) The annual income of an average Chinese family of five persons is \$100 a year.
 - (a) People are in no condition to be happy who lack the necessities of life.
- IV. Our materialism provides a sound basis for the enjoyment of the spiritual side of life.
 - A. Sanitation is preferable to hero worship as a cure for disease.
 - B. Mass production is preferable to miracles or placation of the rain gods for the prevention of famine.
 - C. Professor Beard says, in *Harper's Monthly* of August, 1929
 - 1. "Under technology and science the love of beauty, the sense of mystery, and the motive of compassion. . . are not destroyed."
 - a. "But the conditions under which they must operate are all changed."
 - 2. They will become just in the proportion that men and women accept the inevitability of science and the machine.
- V. Any losses suffered thru materialism are more than compensated for by the gains.
 - A. Science has been used as a tool to create human happiness.

- B. This is evidenced by the contrast in conditions between America and China.
1. In transportation.
 - a. There are few means of transportation in China, except the rickshaw and a few scattered trains.
 2. In medicine.
 - a. Western medical skill has overcome the worst oriental diseases, such as cholera and leprosy.
(1) Eastern philosophy was unable to do it.
 3. In living conditions.
 - a. Americans would consider themselves terribly imposed upon if forced to live as most of the Chinese do.
 4. In luxuries.
 - a. Electric light, the telegraph, the telephone and the radio are almost unknown in China.
 5. Western methods of agriculture are being used to relieve causes of famine in China.

ORIENTAL VERSUS WESTERN CIVILIZATION

CHINESE DEBATING COUNCIL OF
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

and

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

LAMAR T. BEMAN

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Tonight we have the pleasure of having a rather unusual debate. Two young men from Western Reserve University are going to debate with two young men from the great nation of China. As representing Criterion Lodge, I am glad to welcome both the young men from China and the young men from Western Reserve here at our hall. The chairman of the evening will be a young man who is a graduate assistant in the Department of Speech at Western Reserve University, Mr. Ralph A. Colbert, and I am glad to introduce to you Mr. Colbert.

CHAIRMAN

Ralph A. Colbert

MR. BEMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: A number of years ago Kipling told us that "East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." He was wrong. We are going to enjoy the rather rare privilege tonight of seeing two young men, two graduate students from Harvard University, meet at least in a discussion with two students from Western Reserve University. It is my privilege at this time to officially welcome these two men who have come a very long way to discuss this question this evening.

By the way, I might tell you that some of you who think you

have come a long way from home to this meeting have nothing to compare with these men. They are on a far greater journey. They are going on across our continent meeting students of other universities to discuss this question, and then they are taking a new boat across to their home land where they intend to remain. So it really is a rare privilege to have them with us tonight to discuss this question.

The discussion tonight will not be in the ordinary form of a debate. This is to be a symposium, a discussion of the question of eastern civilization and philosophy and western or American civilization and philosophy. The two gentlemen from Reserve may, for all we know, come out in favor of Chinese philosophy and Chinese civilization, while on the other hand, as far as I am able to ascertain—I don't know anything about it—the two representatives of the great Chinese nation might find some merit in western civilization. This is not an ordinary debate; it is a symposium. The two men from Reserve may disagree with each other, and you are not to be surprised at what you hear.

Now all of you have the usual ballot, with which you are perhaps at this time familiar. As some of you know, Western Reserve University, particularly Professor Woodward of that university, is very much interested in what the audiences before which these boys speak are thinking, and we want to know what your opinion is on the question that will be discussed this evening. The question is this: Is the Chinese philosophy of life more conducive to human happiness than the American philosophy of life? Now if you believe that the Chinese philosophy of life is more conducive to happiness than the American philosophy of life, you will indicate that belief on your ballot, the part marked "before the discussion," by marking the square next to the word "yes." Now, if you are undecided, indicate that on the ballot. On the other hand, if you believe that the Chinese philosophy of life is not more conducive to happiness than the American philosophy of life, indicate that, marking the ballot "no." Will you all please mark your ballots at this time. Is that perfectly clear?

Well, I will assume now that you have all marked your ballots and we will proceed to the discussion. The speaker will be Mr. Kwong. I might tell you something about Mr. Kwong. He was a student at the University of St. Johns at Hongkong, China, and also a student at Harvard University, at which school

he was captain of the debating team, where he won the Coolidge Trophy which was offered by Yale and Harvard. So we have indeed a very distinguished speaker whom it is my privilege to present to you this evening.

VICTOR K. KWONG, HARVARD

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We are here tonight as representatives of the Chinese Debating Council to discuss the question of Chinese philosophy as contrasted with the American philosophy of life in its bearing on human happiness, with the gentlemen from Western Reserve. We are particularly happy because we feel that the cause of better international understanding will be served if we discuss this subject here tonight with you.

You know, in the past the American people have always thought of the Chinese people as composed of only two classes—either a Chinaman is a laundryman or a chop suey artist. One or the other. But nothing can be farther from the truth. We have our laborers, of course, but we also have our intellectual classes, our statesmen for instance, our scholars and our business men, and all the other classes that go to make up a people.

And I hope, too, that after the discussion you will realize that China has more than mere laundrymen or chop suey men. For instance, I have often tried hard to tell people in America that no matter what else I can do, I certainly can not iron a shirt very well for them. They will have to go around the corner to get their laundry done, or anything like that.

Tonight in this subject of the philosophy of life we hope to bring out to you some of the things that you don't know about the Chinese nation, things that are quite different from what you usually conceive as Chinese. In the average western mind the Chinese is made up of the opium smokers or men who do dark and devious deeds that do not much credit to any nation or anything like that. Of course, now and then you may have heard of other things of China, such as Confucius, Mencius, and Lao Tsze and the names of others that have come to you very often. In this discussion we will show to you some of the more intangible things of our Chinese civilization that has made China, with all due modesty, a great nation for the last four thousand years.

We are here not to prove that we are a superior race, a su-

perior race to every other race in the world. No. The main substance of our civilization will prevent us from considering us as this race, the superior race. We recognize ourselves just as one race. There may be other races that are as good as ours but we certainly do not want to rule over them or to domineer over them. We like to live our lives and we are willing to let other people live their way.

One of our philosophers has said the phrase, "Live and let live," and that is our philosophy; but at the same time we feel that we can observe the customs and the civilization and the philosophy of life of other peoples; and if you will allow us, we would like to present to you some of the results of our thinking. If you like them, why you may adopt them, and if you do not, you can send us back to China as quickly as you can.

And so, I want to tell you this also, that if we are a little too frank in our analysis of the American's philosophy of life, you will be good enough to excuse us and pardon us, because otherwise we would not have this discussion. We recognize we are guests here in this great city of Cleveland and you owe to us the courtesy of guests and so we feel all the more the obligation if we are a little too frank in our analysis of your philosophy of life.

To get to the subject then—the American philosophy of life. This is the house cleaning, as it were, so be prepared.

The first thing we find, I think, in the American philosophy of life as we see it, is that you are a little too materialistic in your conceptions of what are the most important things in life. You take the average American when he is happy. He is happy when he has bought his car, for instance. He is happy when he has bought his first radio, and he is happy when he can take a trip to Europe, for instance. He is happy when he has bought a fine home that can beat all the others. He is happy when he has all these material things.

Take the housewife. She is happy when she has a Hoover cleaning machine, for instance. She is happy when she has bought a new dress or the one-hundredth new dress, as it were. And she is probably happy when she has a fine, brand new rug; but the point is, she is only happy for a short time, just after the thrill of having bought a new thing. Then after a while, maybe a day or two days or maybe a week, when the novelty has worn off the thing, she lapses into her ordinary routine of life and she or he is ever thinking of a new idea, of how he or

she will get another thrill in life and then he or she will be happy.

That is one of our points, that your civilization doesn't give you a prolonged period of happiness. You are momentarily happy, but because of the very civilization, of the philosophy of life of Americans, you can not be happy for long. What is more, you never will be because so long as you place the values of life in the materialistic things, so long you will not be happy because there is no end to materialistic things. One hundred years ago we didn't have the radio or automobile or telephone, but each day new inventions come, new discoveries are made, and so as the years go by, new things, and new things, and new things; and you will never be able to buy all the new things in the world. The trouble with Americans is that unless they can get every possible thing they can not and won't be happy.

Well, that you can very well see in almost any town or city in the United States. In fact, money, the almighty dollar, is the criterion of success in America. Indeed so much is this so that you classify people here in America as—well, John Smith, he is a good fellow, he is in the \$5,000 class. Every year he makes \$5,000. There goes Tom Brown. He is in the \$6,000 class. There goes Andy Smith. He makes \$10,000. He is in the \$10,000 class. And each one of you individuals is classified like so many automobiles or as the best car in the \$1,000 market, or in the \$1500 class. That is what you do with everything here. You classify according to the money standard—\$5,000, \$6,000 or \$10,000, the millionaires, or whatnot, and that is the most important thing in America—money the almighty dollar. Because you go chasing after the almighty dollar too seriously, you forget there are spiritual things in life; but our Chinese philosophy of life is stressing the spirit of philosophy rather than the materialistic.

We maintain that to get permanent happiness you must have the spiritual values of life rather than the materialistic. Of course, we don't mean to say that a man can be happy without his three meals a day or without sufficient clothes to wear or without a nice home to live in. He must have these prerequisites—food, clothes and shelter, but after he has them he then should not be spending every moment of his life to increase his bank account. Rather must he live his life in as rich a manner, rich in point of view of spiritual rather than the materialistic goods, and that is why in China we think we have more hap-

piness, although of course we may be far from rich. We are not as rich as you are. You have gold reserves whereas we only have silver. You have your automobiles and radios and telephones which our nation doesn't have. Do we regret it? We are not as agricultural a nation as you are.

As we see your nation—what is it? A nation of business men only. And what is more, you are always chasing, chasing, chasing that illusive will-o-the-wisp which we call human happiness, and you know you haven't got it. I don't think you have. Your Constitution, for instance, guarantees you certain things, that famous phrase, "Life, liberty"—but the Constitution guarantees you only "the pursuit of happiness." "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." You are guaranteed life and liberty but as far as happiness, your forefathers were pretty wise. They permitted themselves only the phrase "pursuit of happiness." They will guarantee you the right to chase happiness, but I don't think you have it. I think you will be chasing this happiness for a long time to come or until you rearrange your philosophy of life.

Why do I say that you haven't got happiness yet? We will take some of the conditions in your country. You know, as well as I do that in every five marriages there is at least one divorce. Do you think that is a very nice state of affairs for a great American nation like you to be in? Back in China we don't have anything like divorce. People get married with the firm intention of staying married. When they marry, they don't know each other very well, of course, but they set out with a determination to go and appreciate that other person, and they make the best out of life they can, whereas in America it is different. They are all out for a thrill and unless that man can keep on thrilling her or unless the lady has a charm throughout the years, why I am afraid that a divorce will correct the marriage pretty soon. But in China it is different. We learn to control our intimate natures. We limit our desires. We don't have new desires every day and try to satisfy those desires. That is one of the most important differences between the Chinese philosophy and the American philosophy. We get happiness by controlling our inward natures, our souls as it were, our hearts, inward spiritual things; and you get your happiness in trying to control outward nature, in developing a coal mine, for instance, and in making new things to control the environment. In expressing yourselves that way, you try to satisfy every de-

sire, but you know as well as I do that there is no limit to desires. You can have a desire today and another desire tomorrow and you will be satisfying this and that but you will never end.

And that is why I say that until you can learn to control your inward natures and seek happiness there, you will not be able to get it very soon.

Then you see the social unrest among your younger generation. They go off on wild sprees, as it were, and in high-powered automobiles go racing around the country at eighty miles per hour running over this and that without any care at all. They are on their way. They have got to get somewhere, but it doesn't matter where they go as long as they get there at a fast speed, and that is because they want a new thrill. That is one symptom of the American philosophy of life.

And what is more, take your big apartment houses. Are the human values there? Not at all. A man may live in an apartment and he may not even know the man who lives next to him. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" the Christian religion tells us to do, but you don't even know your next door neighbors in the big apartment houses. In the morning you see them on the stairs and you go by without saying good morning. What is the result? Why, you get to thinking of materialistic things and you forget the human things such as "love thy neighbor as thyself" and "to honor thy parents" with all the love you have.

The younger generation as soon as it can goes to another city and tries to make a future for itself. In China it is different. We like to stay with our parents and comfort them in their old age. We don't care about material success so long as we succeed in making them happy, for human relationship and spiritual values predominate. We don't leave the old folks at home in China because we don't need the material things. Here the young people run away and leave the old folks. In China we take care of them, the sons and daughters.

So then, my thesis is that the Chinese philosophy of life finds its happiness in the spiritual things, in the things of the heart and in controlling the desires of the inward nature, whereas you want your happiness in materialistic things and because there is no end to materialistic things then you will not achieve happiness until you can get all the materialistic things in the world that you can. Obviously you know that can't be done, so unless you change your philosophy of life a little and try to con-

trol your inward, intimate natures a little, you will not get human happiness.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—I am sure, Mr. Kwong, anyone who came here tonight with the idea of getting a recipe for intricate Chinese dishes which Americans have invented, has by now discovered that the discussion tonight is going to furnish us with recipes for intellectual diet, and I, for one, appreciate the food for thought you have given us concerning some of the deficiencies of our American philosophy of life as contrasted with that of the Chinese.

Our symposium tonight will be continued by Mr. Andrew Pangrave of Western Reserve University. (Applause)

ANDREW PANGRAVE, WESTERN RESERVE

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We wish the gentlemen from China success and happiness on their trip from Harvard to California. We wish them success in their venture. We wish them a great deal of happiness. We wish that our materialistic civilization in the United States will provide them with time to enjoy their philosophical communications; and we wish that as they go from Cleveland to the next point of debate, some place out west, that our modern materialistic locomotive will bear them safely at the rate of sixty or seventy miles per hour.

Gentlemen, we are going to discuss philosophy tonight. The philosophy of the United States is more conducive to happiness than the philosophy of China. In Webster's International Dictionary a definition of philosophy is given. Webster says, "It is a systematic body of general conceptions of principles ordinarily with implications of practical application, as a philosophy of life." You will note that this definition, includes a practical application of these general conceptions or principles. A system of thought or wisdom which is unproductive of practical good is valueless.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Kwong has painted for you a rather bright picture of China. He has told you they have a spiritual happiness. They know how to appreciate life. In my discussion I will show you that the spiritual conception of life that he has been talking about is appreciated by only a very small group of the Chinese people. I will show you later on that it is appreciated by less than one-quarter of one per cent

of the Chinese nation; and growing side by side with this system of philosophy is a system that is just the opposite of it, where misery and famine and starvation and poverty and want exist.

Now, Gentlemen, our nation was born as a colony of an imperialistic, intelligent monarchy, and when in 1776 our forefathers were bold enough to declare that we should be free, that we had a right to be free, the historical and political sages of Europe and England lifted up their heads in amazement at this new upstart. Later when we won our political independence, when we asserted the principle that "all men are created equal," that we have an inalienable right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," when we gave the world this principle these political sages looked at us and said, "It is beautiful, but it is hopeless." Later on when we as a nation prospered they predicted that our nation would be washed on the rocks in ten years and then twenty, later it was thirty, later forty, later fifty years, and still nothing happened. Then when we entered into our Civil War, when our nation was broken up into two seemingly irreconcilable factions, these same gentlemen said, "At last they have struck the reef and the national principle of democracy will no longer continue to exist." When our nation passed over this period of strife, the gentlemen were not so sure they were right in predicting the fall of our government. Then came the great World War and our nation became the most prosperous nation in the world, and the gentlemen forgot our political system and they accepted it probably as a good system, but then they saw developing in the United States a kind of culture. They called it culture for want of a better name. They found something entirely different from what existed in other countries. They found that everybody had an automobile or a Ford, that everybody was seemingly happy, that everybody had a home or else he was working for a home. They found out that our American people were slightly different from the people of the rest of the world. They seemed to be happy.

On looking over our system a little further they found out there was something else that was different here in the United States. They found a new kind of industry. They called it mass production, and they looked at it and they said just as the class of philosophers in 1776, "Something new, it can't work." And then later on they said, "This thing does not provide happiness for the people because it is a mechanical thing. It makes

men merely mechanical Robots. These people are not at all happy." And yet when they looked over the situation they found out that many people had everything they wanted, everything they needed. They said, "This is mechanized thought in the United States and that provides unhappiness."

They said that, because of this mass production, the United States was losing the culture, that it could not any longer appreciate the philosophy of life as these gentlemen have said, and yet an eminent Chinese philosopher, Dr. Hu Shih, in looking over our American system has said that he "perceived in the scientific age of America not only the physical advantages of improved health but spiritual benefits unknown in the Orient." He avers that the western master of matter is a real spirituality and that the masses of Europe and the United States are freer, happier and safer than the masses of Asia, that they are so because of what is termed materialism, which is in truth a spiritualization of matter, whereas spirituality is a compensatory escape from a matter which has not been conquered and is not understood.

When Mr. Hu Shih made these comments he was probably referring to our prosperity. He was referring probably to our vast educational system which is probably larger than anything the world has ever seen in the way of education. He was probably referring to our Art museums, to our libraries which are found in all parts of the country. He probably had in mind America's possession of the necessities of life and in most cases of luxuries as well.

And in contrast to this, we find a nation—China—which is an honorable nation four thousand years old, as the gentleman has said, and probably more, possessing a very honorable philosophy of life. It delights in the beauties of pure learning or learning for its own sake, but not the practical application of this philosophical theory to life. What do we find in China? We find in China a nation composed of two distinct groups, not a lot of groups as Mr. Kwong has said, groups constituting \$2,000 and \$3,000 and \$4,000 classes. We don't find anything like that. Mr. Beard has said, "There are two distinct groups in China. There is first the vestigial remains of the old aristocratic order and students comprising 960,000 people. They are the people that can enjoy this philosophy of life. They are the people who have the time and the economic means to enjoy this philosophy of life. And then the second group is the mass of

people, 449,000,000 odd souls. The second group, 449,000,000 souls—what is their philosophy of life?

Gentlemen, let me describe as best I can, not from actual observation of China but from what authorities who have traveled over China tell us about that great country. We find in China these two groups, one which can enjoy the philosophy of life and the other famine-stricken, poverty-stricken, which can enjoy very few of the necessities of life. Backward agriculturally, industrially they are almost as backward as they are agriculturally. And these same people, this group of 449,000,000 people, are common laborers. We find apprentices who work twelve or more hours a day, and we find the common laboring class. The apprentice works for what? A mere meagre existence, and the laboring class, what do they earn? Well, in 1922 the International Famine Commission composed of leading educational institutions in a report found that the annual income of an average Chinese family of five people was \$100 a year.

Now the gentlemen may say that happiness can not be measured by dollars and cents. Very well. It probably can be measured by the lack of the necessities of life. How can a person become happy if he lacks clothes and it is cold? How can he become happy if he lacks the money to buy food and he needs food? How can he be happy if in certain times he can't even buy food if he has the money for it. And yet the philosophical system that is supposed to produce this happiness is growing side by side with this condition that I am describing to you now, this poverty stricken mass of 449,000,000 people.

Two independent investigations recently disclosed an average of one famine a year in China since the Christian Era, since 191 A. D. One famine lasted from 1876 to 1879 and wasted thirty million lives. Another famine in 1920, I believe, caused the deaths of five hundred thousand people. Mr. Mallory, in his book, *China, Land of Famine* enumerates the causes of these famines. Among other things, he says it is due to ancestor worship, high birth rate, early marriages, social waste due to feasts and public ceremonies, burial customs, especially the use of tillable land for graves, waste of time and the conservatism of the people. Thirty million people died in 1876 to 1879 and five hundred thousand people died in the famine of 1920.

Is this philosophy of theirs producing happiness? This philosophy that keeps the Chinese people a backward race of people, is it producing the happiness these gentlemen say it does pro-

duce? You will notice in the discussion so far Mr. Kwong has dealt merely with the United States. He has said our United States is materialistic. It lacks all this philosophical thought of China. But yet he has not told you to what particular group this philosophy of life was available, in what particular group this happiness could be appreciated.

Now to step down to the concrete, let me ask you a few questions in contrasting the philosophy of China with the philosophy of life of America which gives equal opportunity to all, which gives everybody an opportunity to provide for the existence of his body, to provide himself with the comforts of life by decreasing the number of hours he has to work at mechanical labor so he has more time for philosophical meditation. Let me ask you this question in contrasting China and the United States: Is the prevention of disease by sanitation more materialistic than curing it by worship at the graves of the ancestors? Is feeding the multitudes by mass production more materialistic than feeding them by miracle? Is the elimination of famine by a better distribution of goods more materialistic than prevention by the placation of the rain gods? I ask you those questions. My own personal reaction is that it is not. First, we should provide for the comforts of life and by providing for them we should seek to have more time for philosophical meditation.

Now, Gentlemen, the hope of philosophical thought existing in America is not entirely destroyed. Let me quote in closing what Professor Beard in *Harper's Monthly* of August, 1929, says about the philosophy of the United States, as to whether it is destroyed or not: "Under technology and science the love of beauty, the sense of mystery, and the motive of compassion—the sources of aesthetics, religion and humanism—are not destroyed. They remain essential parts of our nature. But the conditions under which they must operate are all changed. These ancient forces will become powerful in the modern age just in the proportion that men and women accept the inevitability of science and the machine, just as soon as they understand the nature of a civilization in which they must work, and turn their faces resolutely toward the future." (Applause)

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—The discussion this evening will be continued by Mr. Kiang of Nanking University, China, and of Harvard. (Applause)

PETER K. KIANG, HARVARD

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Several years ago when I first came to this country I passed through Cleveland and enjoyed the trip very much. Now at this time I am passing through Cleveland again and having this privilege and honor to stop over here to make this little discussion, the Chinese philosophy of life as compared to the American philosophy of life relative to human happiness.

I have found so far that my trip is more pleasant than the last one I took. The simple reason is this: I can see that I have learned not to be controlled by material things but to control the material things, that is basing it on the Chinese philosophy of life.

To the Chinese the philosophy of life is a chart organized according to the different values that we can get from life. Living is an art. In doing this we try to evaluate the different things that are going on in our daily life. In this country you will find a collective activity, rushing here and there, which has been so dominant that life is just hustling and bustling. You get up early in the morning probably eight o'clock. The breakfast probably would be ready for you but you really don't eat. You chuck your toast in and swallow your coffee and rush to get the trolley car to your office; and the same thing in the evening,—you are rushed back from the office. And the whole mass is doing the same thing. When the sign is green, you go, and when it is red, you stop. On account of this collective activity you have practically lost speech individuality.

This collective mass of activity may increase economic strength but at the same time you will find that it produces psychological simplicity. In China the mass lives in a different way. There is no hurry. There is no rush. Individuals are engaged in different things according to their time, according to their desires.

Of course, you may say that only a certain group enjoys such a life, which is quite true, but this "certain group" that is enjoying this sort of life may tend to stress too much the material things and to be controlled by the material things. The Chinese people like to have nice homes. Probably they all enjoy a shower bath rather than the old-fashioned wooden tub, but yet at the same time, it doesn't mean that a poor man in China

taking a bath, probably in a little bath tub, is not happy. They sing just the same. It is probably only the wealthy people who are taking baths in porcelain tubs.

Happiness isn't what you have, in the quantity of things. Happiness to the Chinese is the satisfaction of what you have. At the present time you will find famines and starvation and civil war. They are not taught by our philosophy of life or the ideals of our philosophy. They are only caused by some contemporary or uncontrolled things like an earthquake, like a flood, like a draught. It doesn't mean that the Chinese people are not happy because of these things uncontrolled. The Chinese have learned to control their inward desires. Probably to the materialistic minded people they are probably living in misery on account of the famine. But as to the mass in general in China, they still live in hope. They still live in hope. You probably remember your forefathers when they landed at Plymouth. They had hardships but they lived in hope, so do the Chinese.

At the present time on account of the civil war, contemporary things are happening but they will not last long. Dr. Hu Shih, a well-known Chinese philosopher, has been educated in this country and he says, "The utility of the philosophy of life in this country"—I quite agree with him to a certain extent—"to the Chinese, of course, is that to a certain degree the western philosophy of life has done something for China." But as a whole, has it really accomplished much, giving the Chinese people satisfaction in life? You have heard about the unrest in the Orient. What have we got in China from the West? We have received very many things like schools, hospitals, things like mortality and concessions and equal treaties, and once in a while you will see some big gun boats and marines parading on the streets. Of course, these are the things that are being introduced more or less into the economic system of China and also the military system in China.

We question whether these things are making the Chinese happier than they were during the past four thousand years. In our Chinese homes you will find that the wife considers making the home better not a problem only as right or wrong, but a problem of duty too. In the American home you will find once in a while probably the husband is happy and the wife is happy but generally speaking the men are sad and the women are uneasy. The women are uneasy because they always expect to get something that will never come, while the men have to be go-

getters, getting, getting all the time, and the women spending, to make the home more a social center rather than a family circle.

It is not so in China. The Chinese consider the home as a sharing proposition. There is the philosophy of sharing. You share whatever you have with the members of your family and this produces the outstanding principle of relationship—the father and son, the son and the father, then the mother and daughter, and the husband and wife, and then sister and brother, and brother and sister, and then later on you extend to friends. The Chinese system is a family system. We enjoy living together while you enjoy living separately, but we question whether the young couple driving in a little car going after they are married to some paradise in the country spending their honeymoon are really enjoying themselves or not, or do they start to enjoy themselves on credit? You will find a great many American students leaving college generally in debt. They begin life on credit. It is because of the American system of living.

You have heard about the Chinese girls being suppressed because the old philosophy of life in China doesn't believe in uplifting women. That may be true to a certain extent, but as a whole, are the Chinese girls really not happy? Friends, they are happy. Are the American girls happy? I think the American girls are charming, clever, very attractive, but looking closely you will find that the American girls with their outward charm compared with the Chinese girls, their oriental sisters, if you please and will pardon my saying it, are entirely different. There was a story told about the Chinese girls now-a-days trying to copy the west. They have begun to paint their faces like their western sisters. A missionary was teaching the Chinese girls in one of the eastern school gymnasiums. They introduced dumb bells. They told the girls not to use too much paint but to use dumb bells to get color. One of the Chinese girls said, "Well, you are quite right, but may I ask whether it is true or not that the American girls are using color to get dumb bells?" (Laughter)

Because of this materialistic world, the American sisters or American girls are being controlled by artificial means. The eastern or Chinese girls find happiness in keeping their finer qualities, not indulging in artificial means of making them more charming and more attractive.

The Chinese youths do not have automobiles. They don't

go to gay parties. They don't go to dances, and yet they are happy. In China we consider the automobiles used by the youths in this country very dangerous when they are running. We call them the whiskers of the tiger. But in this country I think you all agree with me that you consider those automobiles more dangerous when they stop.

The Chinese philosophy of life in the relationship of the sexes is entirely different from the west. Here boys and girls go to dance halls at night, going back home very late. In a general study by a great philosopher of this country he said that the girls and boys in this country because of this fellowship or intimacy—the boys are generally very tired and the girls are generally very restless. So you see, there is unbalanced life. How can you find the boys and girls in this country happy when they are living an unbalanced life?

You may find that people think when the missionaries and the foreigners go to China, they don't enjoy the Chinese life. They think of China as a backward nation. That may be true, but, Friends, many of them are enjoying themselves in China. Many of the missionaries are sorry when they are called back to this country, when they find they can't go back to China, and this is the general remark that they always give people on China, "When you go to Japan you like Japan; when you go to China you love China and you like to stay there." So they find in China, despite the material things, that China is a place to live where you can really enjoy yourself. That is to say, in China they find some of the finer things of life. You will find in China that we want to live a balanced life. We want material happiness, but that isn't the first thing. What we want is spiritual realization. We want enlightenment and moral protection and cultural attainment. I thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Mr. Wanamaker of Western Reserve University will be the last speaker this evening in our symposium of oriental and western civilization. (Applause)

JOHN WANAMAKER, WESTERN RESERVE

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It would seem from the remarks of Mr. Kiang that Chinese girls are "happy" and American girls are "whoopee." There has been on this subject what someone has wisely called a great deal of sesquipe-

dalian verbiage. You folks can consult Webster, as I did. It is a good jaw-twister. But there has been a great deal said on this subject, and a great deal more never has been said and perhaps never will be said.

As the chairman has pointed out, we are here simply to present our own points of view, and you must bear in mind that we are not infallible, and that perhaps we won't agree with your points of view. We leave with you the decision as to whether you agree with one side or the other. Frankly, I don't believe explicitly all Mr. Pangrave has said in regard to the American philosophy of life. I agree with the gentlemen from China when they say we have lost something in our mad rush after materialism. I think perhaps we have lost some of our individuality, and some of our initiative, perhaps; but the point is that, despite this fact, I believe that on the average, and considering everything as a whole, we have made a gain instead of a loss. I believe that the losses we may have suffered through materialism have been more than equalled by the things we have gained in a material way. We refer particularly to science and invention and industry, as Mr. Pangrave pointed out. Our philosophy of life includes not only our mental attitudes, but the applications we make of those attitudes, the applications we make of our knowledge and our learning.

Now there have been different points of view in China and the United States. In China knowledge has been pursued simply because of a desire for the truth. Truth for truth's sake, and it hasn't gone much farther than that. They haven't specialized in the application of science. In the United States, on the other hand, we have simply gone in for concrete application and practicability. We have used science as a tool instead of something to work our minds on; used it as a tool to create human happiness,—at least what we considered was human happiness. We believe that this application of science to modern every-day living has resulted in greater happiness for the average person in the United States. We believe we are happier than we would be if we hadn't made this application of science, if we hadn't adopted this materialistic point of view.

Now why are we happy? What is there in this civilization of ours, in this application of our philosophy of life that would make us happy? Let us consider for a moment some of the contrasting circumstances and conditions of China and America. Transportation, for instance. In China, if we want to go some

place we are very likely to walk; or, if we happen to be fortunate enough to have more money in our pockets than I have at the present time, we might hire a coolie to draw us along in a pretty little cart; or if we are very fortunate, and happen to be going to the right place, we may be able to avail ourselves of a development of western civilization the railway, but trains go to only a very few isolated points.

Contrast that with America. If we want to go to the Public Square to view the city from the Terminal Tower, we immediately run to the street car and the "Vans" take us down; or, if we want to go farther, we go down to the same Terminal, run by these same Van Sweringens, and we get on a train and go to Chicago or New York; or, if we are in a particular hurry, as were some gentlemen from Reserve recently when they were going to a western city for a debate, we go to Cleveland Airport, and take an airplane.

Now we believe that when we can have such facilities at hand, and when we have the ability to utilize the forces of modern science and industry, it has led to greater happiness for the individual person here in America. That is our belief. Would you rather go on foot, or in a little cart drawn by another human being; or would you rather ride in a modern train or airplane? It is just a question for you to answer, in deciding whether you believe Chinese or American philosophies are better.

Take another case. Take medicine, for instance. In China a man becomes ill. They call in the medicine doctor. He says a spirit or a devil has taken possession of the patient and we have to scare that thing out. So they make a lot of noise and racket, and they scare the devil out. They say the man is cured. In America we don't go at it that way. We say there is something wrong. He has some kind of a germ and we go about finding out what that germ is and how to get rid of it. We go to the basic cause. We have found out how to cure some of the greatest ailments that ever beset man. Cholera is the greatest trouble that has been found in the Orient. As far as it has been cured, or brought to a minimum point, it has been done by science, by the application of Western methods and Western civilization; not by the application of Eastern philosophy, but of Western civilization. Leprosy has almost been exterminated by the application of modern medical skill,—medical skill from the West, if you please. The same thing with innumerable oth-

er diseases. Even today we find that out in California some doctors are certain they have a cure for cancer, that terrible malady that has beset mankind, and which seemed to be incurable. They tell us it is going to be cured now. That is the way we go at things according to our Western plan of philosophy. It is entirely different from the Eastern. It is another thing in which we simply have to contrast the one with the other:—We simply have to decide, as I said before, whether or not we would rather have the American civilization. If not, we should go to China; if we prefer it, we are going to stay in America and ride on the street cars and airplanes, and go to our doctors when we become sick.

We might consider buildings and homes. The gentlemen from China have told you that the Chinese, too, enjoy their pretty houses and their comfortable homes. That is characteristic of all mankind. We enjoy beautiful buildings, beautiful homes. How do they contrast with those in China? In China you walk down the streets and perhaps see a great many huts, living quarters or even business quarters. Occasionally you see elegant houses and things of that kind, but they are not common; they are the exception, not the rule. Here, if we had to subject ourselves to extreme poverty, as the Chinese on the whole are forced to do, we would consider ourselves terribly imposed upon, and we certainly couldn't be happy. How many of you people here would be happy living in straw huts? How many would be happy living on a river boat in the Yangtze River, washing your dishes in the river, bathing yourselves in the river. If you want a drink, how would you like to dip down in that river and take the same water and drink it? That is the proposition they are up against. That is the proposition that over-population and a refusal to adopt Western methods has brought on to them. Now we simply have to contrast the two and decide which we want, whether we would have the one or the other.

We might refer to the innumerable electric lights that are lighting this room. They are not enjoyed in many portions of China. Take the radio. We go home from work in the evening and turn it on, and presto! There is Cleveland, Chicago, New York, beautiful programs through the air every evening, something for us to enjoy not simply for only a few times just after we first get a radio but for years and years. You can get Gene and Glenn if you want to, or Amos and Andy, or any of our other favorites. We have the radio, the telephone, the telegraph

—all of these modern inventions and applications of science,—applications **mind you that have been made by Western civilization**, and applications that are now being introduced into the **Eastern countries**.

At the present time the Federation for Prevention of Famine in China is introducing Western methods of irrigation, and is digging a great canal, in an attempt to irrigate lands that have been unfertile for several years, unproductive lands that have resulted in famine. It has been impossible to feed the people, and now, through Western civilization; they are introducing methods there to make it possible to feed those people, to make it possible for them to thrive on the lands that will be irrigated through the advancement of modern Western civilization.

Now **then it simply simmers down** to a matter of what we want and what China wants. Frankly, I don't think I would be happy in China. I don't think I could endure, and still be happy, the privation and suffering that many hundreds of thousands of people are forced to endure in China. It is only a relatively small percentage of those people that have the real comforts of life. I don't think I could be happy under those circumstances, **and I am wondering** how many of you people here could be happy. In China, the people have constantly throughout the ages trimmed down their desires to meet conditions as they actually were. In America, on the other hand, we have trimmed down conditions to meet our desires. In China, if food is not found, we simply say we are not hungry, and we trim down our hunger to meet the supply of food; whereas, in the United States, we find if there isn't enough food, we say that we will get some way to make more food—the application of science again. Just a different view toward life, the matter of whether we want to trim our desires or trim the things with which we satisfy those desires.

I am somewhat like Will Rogers. Will says all he knows is what he reads in the papers. I am not quite that badly off in this case. I have read some other things, but all we know here in America—most of us—about China, is what somebody else has told us. The gentlemen from China certainly have it over us, to use a slang expression. They have been there and know what the conditions are, and it certainly doesn't behoove me to try to dispute anything they might say about the conditions. If I have said anything this evening that has been contrary to fact, I want to assure you that it has been said only on the best

authority I could possibly find. We have only the statements of travelers, historians, etc. to rely upon; and I believe firmly that for China the best possible kind of civilization, and the best possible kind of a philosophy of life, is just what China has. I believe also that for America, the best thing we can do is to continue in the very same way we are going now. It seems, though, that as conditions actually are, we are both going toward the same goal. It seems that America is getting more and more materialistic, whereas in China the same methods of modern science and invention are also being introduced, and they are going toward that same goal. But I wonder—as the gentleman from China has wondered—whether the people over there are going to be happier by an introduction of American methods. I still believe that, for China, the best thing to have is just what is there; and for America, the best thing we can have is what is here.

Now again, in closing, I want to thank all of you people here for your courtesy this evening, and I want to bid the gentlemen from China good-bye, and “bon voyage,” as the Frenchmen say. I hope they have a very enjoyable trip, and a successful one; and I hope when they go back to China they will find the old land there just as they left it, and as they want to find it; and that they will enjoy life with their philosophy as much as we enjoy life here with ours.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Now I don't know how much rushing around you people have been doing in this mad race of American civilization of which we have been hearing, but I do know that at least for the last hour or so you have paused a while to enjoy with me this discussion tonight. And now, while I have you in this lull, and before you go out and resume this mad rush, I wish you would all turn to these ballots which were passed out before the discussion and indicate there what you are thinking during this cessation of activities.

Now you have had tonight laid before you very ably by the gentlemen from China and from Reserve two civilizations—the profound and ancient Oriental or Chinese and our newer Occidental or Western American civilization. They have been presented to you side by side in close juxtaposition, and I want to know now what your opinion is of these two civilizations. You know we are interested at Reserve in knowing whether you have changed your opinion at all during this discussion, so will you now turn to the part of the ballot marked “after the discussion”

and indicate there your belief. To repeat the question as it was stated, is the Chinese civilization and philosophy of life more conducive to happiness than the American? If you believe that it is, you will indicate this on your ballot by marking "yes." Or, if you believe more strongly than you did before that the Chinese civilization is more conducive to happiness than the American, you will so indicate, marking the first square, which shows that you believe more strongly than you did before in answering "yes." On the other hand, if you are now undecided, indicate that on the ballot; while, if you believe that Chinese civilization is not more conducive to happiness than American, mark your ballot "no." If you believe more strongly in answering "no," indicate that. I want you all to mark your ballots at this time. Is that perfectly clear?

QUESTION—Am I to judge it from my own standpoint?

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Yes.

QUESTION—I wondered, because wouldn't it be hard for me to judge from their standpoint, not living under their conditions?

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—What we are interested in now is your opinion. From your own viewpoint do you think that Chinese philosophy is more conducive to happiness than is American philosophy? If you do, mark the ballot "yes." If you don't mark it "no."

Ladies and Gentlemen, as some of you know, it is our custom after these discussions and debates to hold a public forum. The gentlemen from China have indicated their desire and willingness to answer any questions that may be in your minds regarding Chinese customs or Chinese philosophy and they welcome any such interrogations on your part. I am sure some of you must have had some question raised by this discussion.

[Pause for announcements]

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—All right, if our meeting will again come to order. The chairman will entertain any questions which you may direct to either of the two teams which are represented here tonight.

QUESTION—I would like to ask what the American philosophy of life is. From the debate tonight, I judge there isn't any.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—The young lady would like to know what the American philosophy of life is. She says that she hasn't heard any tonight. (Applause)

MR. KIANG—I think you have heard of John Dewey. I think

he represents the typical American. He says that the American philosophy of life is based on pragmatism and materialism. That is the typical American philosophy.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—The gentlemen from China say that pragmatism and materialism is the typical American philosophy. The gentlemen from Reserve concur in that opinion. Is there any other question?

QUESTION—I would like to ask the gentlemen from China just one question. I understand when a baby is expected, great preparations are made for the celebration, great plans, but if the baby happens to turn out to be a girl, all the preparations are done away with and sorrow expressed and very often that makes the mother feel very badly. I am wondering if the gentlemen feel that is conducive to the happiness of the mother or the baby.

MR. KIANG—That custom has been practiced in China, but it isn't universal. It is only practiced in certain parts of China. You will find that the Chinese families are as happy to have ten girls or ten boys. The life of a girl is just as valuable as that of a boy. You find the opposite true according to the old custom, but that isn't universal. It is like the foot binding in China. It is only practiced in certain parts of China.

QUESTION—Mr. Chairman, as has been truly stated here tonight, the great majority of Americans know nothing of China but what they read; and sometimes we have seen in our daily lives that what we read is not true. I would like to ask the gentlemen from China whether or not they would consider a civilization, no matter where it might be, that can provide for its own needs in times of distress as being superior to that civilization, no matter where it might be, that can not provide means for its own protection, for doing away with the thing that is distressing them in time of need, from whatever cause it may be—a famine, uprising in China, China not being able to take care of it. If succor comes, it must come from some outside source. However, in our Western civilization in this country, no matter what has befallen our country, we have always been able to take care of it ourselves. Which of those civilizations is the better in that respect at least?

MR. KWONG—A rather pithy question has been asked me, if the Chinese civilization can not take care of such distressful things, as famines, where on the other hand your American civilization can take care of them, does that mean the Chinese

civilization is inferior to the American? Well, the point to consider is this: All you read about and hear about in China is the spectacular thing—this civil war, the fighting, or the disaster of famine or when some missionaries are shot or things like that—spectacular things. You don't hear about the more constructive phases of our country. You never hear of the philosophy of our nation nor do you ever hear about the literature and the teachings of our civilization.

The famine is only a part of our philosophy, a very small part, may I say? We don't have famines every day, otherwise I wouldn't be here tonight, for instance. Those isolated instances, as it were, are magnified by your press, by the great American people who can only appreciate spectacular and sensational things in another race.

Of course, I want to admit that a famine is not a good thing. We would like to have our three meals a day, but you must not judge a nation by just one thing like that. You must take in the whole, get a comprehensive view of the whole nation. Consider its economic, its social, its religious, its political and philosophical conditions. Combine all those and then you can get your answer.

Now in America you don't have famine. Thank goodness, you don't. But we may say we don't have some of the other things you have. Let me enumerate some of them. Take, for instance, prohibition. (Laughter and applause) Certainly I am sure that the hypocrisy and the awful conditions in your country which have come from prohibition do not sit very well with your nation irrespective of your views on prohibition. You have dry senators and you have wet senators who vote dry, for instance, and these represent the highest people of your race. And then again you have enforcement officials who do not enforce for various reasons, and what is more you have these bootleggers that honeycomb your great cities. Chicago is made notorious by its bootleggers and bootlegger gangs who fight each other for the privilege to sell liquor to high people in the County of Cook, for instance, and these people buy this liquor and are supposed to be respectable.

Then again you have social unrest, divorces and conditions of unrest of the younger generation. Do you call that a very happy thing? No. What is more, you have a great deal of standardization in your whole country. You don't have any individuality. As you go along the country side, you know we

came from Boston, we see the same old advertisements time after time. They tell you to buy some variety of Heintz 57 varieties, to wear certain's men's shoes, or something like that; and again it tells you the Buick is the best car ever made in the history of the world, and things like that. So you don't get individuality. There is no artistic side in your life. You see we consider life as an art—to live well,—and it takes a superior man, I think, to probably do that.

The gentleman from Western Reserve has said he could not be happy in China. I am sure he could not be happy with the view he entertains on life tonight. The only man who can be happy in China is "the superior man" as Confucius once called him, the man who can understand the other side of life, who can see other things in life besides the materialistic. And I am afraid that the American people, like most Westerners, are so steeped in the materialistic that they do not appreciate the spiritual things that bring forth happiness. For instance, oftentimes you receive a letter from an old friend that you have forgotten long, long ago. This old friend tells you he remembers you and sends best wishes. It is just a little thing like that which will make you very, very happy; and you will be thinking all the time of this wonderful friendship that has lasted through the years. That is one sign of spiritual happiness. A cottage you buy or a car you buy, can it possibly give you the same happiness? That is what we are trying to present to you tonight.

You have got to lift yourselves from this low level of materialism to a higher plane. It is quite impossible if you believe in materialism. If you are changing your point of view to appreciate the higher things, the spiritual things, then I am sure you will be able to appreciate our philosophy of life. Much more you will be able to get spiritual realization, mental enlightenment, moral satisfaction and cultural attainment.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Thank you, Mr. Kwong. I think most of us will agree that China has a problem with its famine and we have one with our legal draught. Are there any other questions?

QUESTION—I would like to ask what the attitude of the Chinese generally is toward the missionary of the West?

MR. KIANG—I am a Christian. I have been educated in a missionary school. I am going back into that type of work, religious education and social service. I present to you not my views but the truth. The missionaries, of course, are welcome

in China, but personally speaking missionaries have made many friends in China. They are wanted and they are needed there, but only certain types. You see the missionary movement has been so organized that it had been absorbed into a system. You know it is very easy to find fault with the system or the organization. The criticism of the missionary in China is on the administration or the organization of the movement, but not on the personality of the missionaries. The missionaries have lived with the Chinese, but once in a while you will find a black sheep in a flock. The only criticism that can be made on the missionaries in general is that they are carrying over a superiority complex, thinking that the West can only give and the East is to receive. That is to say, the West or the Christian nations have the truth and that China hasn't. They go there, in other words, with their superiority complex.

Take for instance a certain missionary. He enjoyed everything. This is a true story. He saw in China that many things were missing, like the trolley cars, like the automobile, like electric lights. It happened that he was assigned to a latent city, where those things are missing, so he became a little sarcastic. He got acquainted with the Chinese. He was the sarcastic type, so once in a while he would start sparring with the Chinese and would tell the Chinese they haven't much to give to the world. At a breakfast table he would say the American eggs were larger than the Chinese eggs. In walking out into the moonlight he would say the American moon was brighter than the Chinese moon. So one of the Chinese wanted to get even with him. It happened one day that this Chinese was invited to his house to stay over the week-end to see the customs there that are practiced by the Americans. This Chinese gentleman went to the house, and before he went to the house he went to market and bought a Chinese crab, a tiny little thing and it could certainly bite. Before he went to bed, he found the bedroom of the American missionary, so he slipped the crab into the bed of the missionary. The little crab crawled around, and so at night the missionary was sound asleep, and suddenly he shouted out loud and jumped out of bed. In the excitement, the Chinese gentleman went to his room and said, "Well, friend, what is the matter?"

The missionary answered, "I don't know what it is in my bed." They lit a candle and found the little crab and this American missionary didn't know what it was. The Chinese gentleman

said, "Don't you know? That is a Chinese bed bug. (Laughter) The Chinese bed bug bites harder."

Well, Friends, the missionaries are welcome but only a certain type, those who really love the Chinese, those who are really going to share with the Chinese the best things that you have in this country, that you have in the West—those who are going over there not only to give but also to know more about China and to receive also the better things that China can give to the world. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Are there any further questions?

QUESTION—In contrast to that I would like to have our American representatives state what they would think if a Chinese missionary came over here to convert the Americans. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Mr. Wanamaker, will you speculate on that?

MR. WANAMAKER—Speculation is the word. I rather imagine that, with this same superiority complex that the gentleman has already referred to, we would rather resent the Chinese sending a missionary here. I am afraid we wouldn't be as gracious as are the people of China, and I am afraid that, instead of a crab, to take the place of bed bug, we would go down to the nearest creek and find a little mud turtle and put it in the bed. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Are there any other questions?

QUESTION—(By a Chinese member of the audience) The gentleman from Reserve stated that when the Chinese are sick instead of calling a doctor they call someone to get rid of the evil spirit. That is a strange statement to me. When I was a small boy like this little fellow, I got sick many a time and every time my mother called a doctor and a mighty good doctor, too. As he said, he gets his information from the best authorities he can get it from. I wonder what authority he got that statement from. Of course, we don't have the modern equipment like x-ray or radium to cure diseases but the Chinese doctor is mighty good.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—If that was in the form of a question as to what authority there was for the fact that the Chinese do not use modern methods in medicine, perhaps the gentleman from Reserve would give us the source of his information.

MR. WANAMAKER—That particular information came from Monroe of Columbia in his book *The Evolution of a Nation*, and

it has been found in other sources. As I said in my address, perhaps our information is in error, but we have tried our best to get the true light on the thing, and several missionaries tell us the same thing. We don't believe it is common in all cases of the Chinese but we have heard, on what we consider good authority, that it was common among the poorer classes, in those classes who were not favored by the wealth of the nation. Among the masses of people, that is the custom.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Thank you, Mr. Wanamaker. At any rate, the gentleman back there is living testimony of one person to the contrary. Any other questions?

QUESTION—I would like to ask the gentlemen of China from what class, according to the gentleman's statements from Reserve, do they come from—the class of the nine hundred some odd thousand or from the 449,000,000.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Will you please classify yourselves?

MR. KWONG—It is a great difficulty to talk about yourself in a public symposium. Really I wouldn't want to classify myself in my own opinion before such a large group. Sometime if the gentleman will be good enough to invite me out to a private dinner, probably I can do it. In any case, there is a very easy way out. I am sure with such an intelligent audience here tonight they will have no difficulty in classifying us in two groups.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—I am sure we all agree with you, Mr. Kwong, there is no difficulty.

QUESTION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the Western Reserve students. From what sources have they received the information about the people living on the Yangtze River? I would like to know the percentage of the people living on boats.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—The question is concerning your geography, Mr. Wanamaker.

MR. WANAMAKER—Either I misquoted or I was misunderstood. I didn't mean to say most of the people of China live on boats. It was my impression that a great many do, and I got the information from several travel books and from personal acquaintances who have actually been through China and seen those conditions; They said there were thousands of people living in the boats.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Mr. Pangrave, have you something to say?

MR. PANGRAVE—I have in the cloak room a copy of *China, a Nation in Evolution* by Professor Monroe, who is director of international instruction and professor in Teachers' College, Columbia, and he tells us about the people living in house boats in China and he also has some photographs there. As Mr. Wanamaker says, we don't mean to insinuate that all the people in China do, but there are people who live on house boats, and as to the extent of their population we have to confess that even Mr. Monroe would not give us a percentage or did not actually know. But we will show the authority, and we want to tell you that we are honest in wanting to show you this authority.

QUESTION—Mr. Wanamaker made a statement about the Yangtze River.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Did you have the right river there, Mr. Wanamaker?

MR. WANAMAKER—I am not an authority. I was giving what I thought was the truth.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—I think we have most of the people in China back on dry land. We can continue with the questions and discussion.

QUESTION—If you will travel on the steamers on the Ohio River, beginning with Pittsburgh on to Cairo, you will find thousands of Americans living on house boats, drinking the same water in which they swim.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Now we seem to have a great many Americans afloat. Are there any other questions or comments?

QUESTION—Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may ask a question. A gentleman over there asked the question of the Chinese regarding what they might think of a civilization that couldn't take care of emergencies. The Chinese didn't answer it quite as fully as it seems it might have been answered by asking whether that is resources or civilization. Another question I would like to ask him is whether we could take care of 500,000,000 people quite as easily as we do of 110,000,000 at the present time. I think the question isn't exactly fair. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Does anyone care to take up the retort regarding a nation's capacity to take care of its people?

QUESTION—I asked that question and the question was not answered. The question I put to the gentleman was for that one particular reason. My good friend over there is asking the question whether or not we in the United States could take care of 500,000,000 people as well as we can 110,000,000. My

Dear Friend, don't forget that Western civilization grows with population and if the need comes to take care of 500,000,000 people in this country, this country will be equal to the task.

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Are there any further comments? If there are no further questions, Mr. Kwong wishes to say a few words in parting. (Applause)

MR. KWONG—After almost an hour's discussion on the relative merits of Chinese and American philosophies of life, I suppose we have some idea which is the better. I hope in this criss-cross fire of words and ideas and wits that there has been no enmity engendered by us. I rather hope that we are following the dictum of our great philosopher Confucius of the principle of brotherly love, "under heaven all men are brothers," and that this discussion has brought us to understand each other far better than we have before this discussion. I hope that, irrespective of our feelings on the merits of the Chinese and American philosophies of life, we will be brothers toward each other and understand each other. After all, perhaps what is meat for one man may be poison for another, so that our Chinese philosophy of life may be the better for us and your American philosophy of life may be better for you, although of course I have my doubts.

Your people place emphasis on the material things of life as I have said, and this gentleman to the right has said that if the population is increased to 500,000,000, the country will take care of that 500,000,000. Your American civilization will invent new ways of creating food. For instance, your creameries are hard at work in the laboratories inventing new ways of extracting even butter from coal, or something like that, some seemingly impossible thing. We Chinese marvel at such discoveries and we raise our hats in admiration to the men of science who can push forward the frontiers of knowledge and bring to the human race more material things for their use. But our great point of course is that although you have these material things you have still the problem of the spirit, and no matter how many things you get, no matter how wealthy you are, unless you are spiritually rich you will not be happy. As the Bible once said, "What profiteth a man if he gain the whole world and yet loseth his soul?" That is our point.

You may be wealthy but that doesn't guarantee your happiness. Your forefathers did not have an automobile. When they

had to send a message across to the other side of the town, they probably had to walk there. Do you think your forefathers were not as happy as you are? Maybe they were more happy. I think they were, but it is up to you to decide for yourselves whether you are happy or not. Of course, it is nice to have things. I will admit that. Just as for instance, it is nice to ride in a Packard along the road rather than walk fifty miles. If you don't believe that it is nice to ride in a Packard, "ask the man who owns one." That is one of your slogans in advertising. But the point I make is, don't let those material things control you. Your soul must control the material things, not the material things control your soul, and I am afraid that the material things have just about controlled your soul, the soul of America, so that it makes you ever anxious to chase after these material things. Once you had an automobile that went forty miles an hour. It started with one cylinder, then two. Then people began to say that two cylinders were not enough, and then came four and six and eight and sixteen and thirty-two and forty-eight out west somewhere, and after you have the forty-eight you will probably want something else. You aren't happy, whereas on the other hand, we are still happy in China without these high-powered motor cars.

Therefore, Ladies and Gentlemen, that is the whole point of the discussion. Can we be happy without material things? Yes, of course. I mean you have got to have food and clothing and shelter. Those are absolutely necessary to life. Once you have those fundamental things you must develop the spiritual side of life rather than driving Rolls Royces, airplanes or what-not. For instance, the gentlemen from Reserve took an airplane ride to go to a certain debate, but an airplane is a lifeless thing. It is inanimate; it is material. It hasn't a spirit of its own. For a moment, of course, it served their purpose, but if they go ahead and spend their whole lifetime in developing aviation and forgetting the human side of things, I am afraid that is a bad symbol of civilization.

Three years ago when Lindbergh made his famous flight to Paris, he was immediately the idol of the western world. Everything else was forgotten and on the front pages of the newspapers there was nothing but news of Lindbergh for weeks and weeks in succession. I don't mean to say Lindbergh didn't do a great thing. He did, no doubt. I am sure the Chinese admire

his New York to Paris non-stop flight, but what we Chinese thought at the time was that your materialistic philosophy made you step over the bounds of what we consider the proper evaluation of the good things in life. A man risking his life got to Paris and he is immediately your hero. He is still your hero. Although he did a great thing, do you think he deserves the great admiration he got from the whole western world? Do you think that act of his in flying to Paris created such a great deal of benefit for the human race that he was the first man in all your world? I hardly think so. The President of a university, say the President of Western Reserve or the President of Harvard University may have done far more good than Lindbergh ever accomplished, yet these men are always forgotten. You never hear of the president of Harvard except sometimes. Who knows what the president of Harvard's name is? It is President Lowell, but I am afraid some of you may not have heard of it at all, and yet that man probably has done one thousand times more good than Lindbergh. He has never risked his life but he thinks of the problems of youth and how to solve them, how to lead youth from the darkness into light of education and all such things as that.

What about the scientific work in the laboratories, the frontiers of knowledge. These are quiet men. Take the social workers, for instance. These men think our theories and help people to carry out theories and they are probably far greater men than Lindbergh who just risked his life in order to accomplish a daring deed.

That is an actual fact of what we consider your unbalanced point of view. You glorify something that is not as important as other things. We glorify Confucius and I think we are right in glorifying Confucius because he has taught us many things. In our scale of values the scholar always comes first. He is the man, not the daring man, not the business man, nor anything like that. In Chinese we call him Sz. There are four classes in China. The scholar is the first man. He is the leader in the community. He thinks out ideas and is the center of culture. He is the ideal of moral attainment and cultural attainment. Then there is the Nung, the agriculturalist or farmer. We place him second because we think without him we would never be able to get along. The good things of nature are utilized by the farmer for the good of all. The farmer is second.

Then we place third the laborer. We think the laborer deserves a place because he sweats by his brow and because by the sweat he is able to enjoy a lot of things we would not otherwise have. And lastly we place the business man. I am sorry to say there are a lot of business men here, but I want to give you the truth of the Chinese civilization. But lastly we place the business man because we think he just utilizes the labor of others to transfer values rather than create them, and so those are our classifications—the scholar first, the farmer second, the laborer third and the business man fourth, Sz, Nung, Kung and Sheng.

Anyone who wants to achieve reknown in China has to be the scholar or he has to benefit the whole race in a concrete manner and in a moral manner before we can give him the hero worship that you unfortunately gave to Lindbergh in such a disproportionate measure.

So, therefore, let me conclude my remarks to you tonight. We are just a peaceful nation. We do not impose our civilization on others if they don't want it. We are not like some peoples who in their desire to control the material world, push forth the boundaries of their empires to other lands, to other peoples and impose upon those peoples their idea of civilization. You have a glaring example of it in Asia where there are a lot of foreign flags flying on the shore of Asia. We are peaceful and we don't want to impose our civilization on others. We believe in living our own lives, such a life that would be inconsistent with, say imperialism, where one nation goes forth to another nation and tells them their customs are not well handled and cities not well governed, and therefore, they want to govern ourselves but the superiority complex of the white man, for instance, comes to our shores and says, "you must buy our motor cars, you must chew our chewing gum, you must wear our clothes, therefore you must adopt our standards." Of course, you may enjoy them, but why impose them upon us unless we want them? "Do unto others as you would be done by," Jesus Christ Himself said that. But are the white people—so-called Christians,—following the dictum of Jesus Christ? Do they "do unto others as they wish others to do unto them?" I am afraid they do not.

So I just want to make a comparison of the Chinese civilization and the Western civilization. No matter what is evil in our civilization we certainly don't go forth imperialistically and

impose our civilization upon others. All we want is to be let alone and to enlighten by education the other peoples of the world, and if they can appreciate some of the finer things in our civilization, well and good, let them appreciate them. I am sure there must be something in the Chinese civilization to enable it to last four thousand years. We have had our civilization as long as that. When Rome was in its prime, China was civilized and also flourishing. Today what do you find? You find nothing but the great history of Gibbons called *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. The Roman Empire has died. China still flourishes. Even when Egypt was flourishing our civilization was existing. The Egyptian civilization has gone, but we still remain. The same thing may be true of your great American civilization in the sense of materialism. You are great now. You feel you are the most powerful nation in the world. Probably you are, but as you know, material force may not be the everlasting thing. If you were to go back to history, you would find the Roman citizens saying, "I am a Roman citizen." They felt themselves great, the most powerful people in the world. Naturally they were right to feel themselves great because the Roman Empire existed all over Europe. Yet in spite of the greatness, decay set in and the civilization crumbled and fell to pieces.

You may feel yourselves great but what happened to Rome may repeat itself in the world history. Therefore, I hope that you will take a lesson from these things and try to understand the more spiritual side of life.

We have sent students to America to study you, to study your civilization. Have you ever heard of American students going to China to study our civilization and trying to learn something of our four thousand year old civilization? No, you are too sure of yourselves. You think you have it and nobody else can be better, but I think we are endowed with just a little more desire to find out about you and perhaps if you have some thing to teach us, we will attempt them. I hope, therefore, that this discussion may stimulate in your minds a greater desire to know our country, China, and that you may have a better appreciation of my great country of China. I thank you. (Extended applause)

CHAIRMAN COLBERT—Mr. Kwong and Mr. Kiang, I know you realize that this audience here appreciates the fact that

Chinese civilization, as you have indicated, has a great lesson for American civilization, and we are very glad that in your visit here and in your process of acquiring some understanding of American civilization you have paused on your way home to instruct us in a measure of Chinese civilization. I am confident that this group joins with me in wishing you a very happy voyage home and a measure of American prosperity from our viewpoint as well as of Chinese philosophy and quiet life. We hope you will enjoy all of that in the future.

I want to thank this organization in the name of the Department of Speech of Western Reserve University for the opportunity of holding this symposium here. This has been a fine audience. Good evening.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIENTAL VERSUS WESTERN CIVILIZATION

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Annals of the American Academy. 122:214-27. N. '25. List of books on China. William Adams Slade.
- China Weekly Review. Best books on China. 29:159-60. Jl. 5, '24.
- Earle, E. M. and Billings, F. Problem of the Near East. 25c. Carnegie Endowment. Div. of Intercourse and Education. '24.
- Johnsen, Julia E. comp. China and Japan. (Reference Shelf. vol. 1. no. 2.) p. 41-51. 50c. H. W. Wilson Company, N.Y. '22.
- Johnsen, Julia E. comp. China, yesterday and to-day. (Handbook series ser. II. vol. 3.) p. xv-lxx. \$2.40. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '28.
- Monroe, Paul. China: Nation in evolution. p. 434-9. Macmillan. N.Y. '28.
- United States. Library of Congress. China. Public Affairs Information Service. N.Y. D. 16, '26.
- United States. Library of Congress. Chinese immigration, 1912-1919. N. 28, '19. Wash. D.C.
- United States. Library of Congress. List of recent references on China under republican form of government. 6p. typw. 70c. Public Affairs Information Service. N.Y. Mr. 17, '22.
- United States. Library of Congress. Recent books of the Far East. (2 lists) N. 25, '16. S. 12, '19.
- Williams, Frederick Wells and Price, Frank W. Best hundred books on China. Yale Univ. Library. New Haven, Conn. '24.
- Windeyer, M. China and the Far East. 20c. N.Y. State Library. Albany. '01.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Adams, J. T. Our business civilization. Albert and Charles Boni. N.Y. '29.
- Allen, C. W. Chinese proverbs. Mission Book Co. Shanghai. '26.
- Anti-Christian movement. Y.W.C.A. Shanghai.
- Bashford, James W. China; an interpretation. Abingdon Press. N.Y. '19.
- Bau, M. J. Foreign relations of China. Revell. N.Y. '22.
- Beresford, Lord Charles. Break-up of China. Harper. N.Y. '99.
- Bland, J. O. P. Recent events and present policies in China. Lippincott. N.Y. '12.
- Borsodi, Ralph. This ugly civilization. Simon and Schuster. N.Y. '29.
- Buell, R. L. Problem of the Pacific. 5c. World Peace Foundation. Bost. '25.
- Chalmers-Werne, E. T. Myths and legends of China. Brentano. N.Y. '22.
- Cheng, S. G. Modern China. Oxford. N.Y. '19.
- Chiang, Monlin. Studies in Chinese principles of education. Stechert. N.Y. '24.
- China Christian year book. Fourteenth issue; 1926. Christian Literature Soc. Shanghai. '26.
- China's economic resources. Univ. of Chicago Press. Chic.
- Clennell, W. J. Historical development of religions in China. Dutton. N.Y. '17.
- Close, Upton. Revolt of Asia. Putnam. N.Y. '27.
- Commercial handbook of China. Govt. Ptg. Off. Wash. D.C. '19.
- Dennett, Tyler. Americans in eastern Asia. Macmillan. N.Y. '22.
- Dennis, A. L. P. Foreign policies of Soviet Russia. Dutton. N.Y. '24.
- Dewey, John. China, Japan, and the United States of America. Republic Pub. Co. N.Y. '21.
- Dutcher, G. W. Political awakening of the Far East. Abingdon Press. N.Y. '25.
- Edkin, J. Religions in China. Kegan Paul. Lond.

- Eu-Yang, K. Political reconstruction of China. Commercial Press. Shanghai. '22.
- Fay, Bernard and Claflin, Avery. American experiment. Harcourt. N.Y. '29.
- Foster, John W. American diplomacy in the Orient. Houghton Mifflin. Bost. '03.
- Frank, W. D. Re-discovery of America. Scribner. N.Y. '20.
- Geil, W. E. Sacred five of China. John Murray. Lond. '27.
- Gilbert, Rodney. What's wrong with China? John Murray. Lond. '26.
- Giles, H. A. China and the Chinese. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '12.
- Giles, H. A. History of Chinese literature. Appleton. N.Y. '01.
- Godnow, F. J. China, an analysis. Johns Hopkins Press. Balt. '26.
- Gowen, H. H. Outline history of China. Sherman French. Bost. '16.
- Hodgkin, H. T. China in the family of nations. Allen and Unwin. Lond. '23.
- Holcomb, C. Real Chinamen. Dodd, Mead. N.Y. '29.
- Hornbeck, S. K. Contemporary politics in the Far East. Appleton. N.Y. '16.
- Hovelaque, Emile I. China. Dutton. N.Y. '23.
- Hulbert, A. B. Frontiers. Little, Brown. Bost. '29.
- Huntington, Ellsworth. Civilization and climate. Yale Univ. Press. New Haven, Conn. '22.
- Johnsen, J. E. comp. China and Japan. (Reference Shelf. vol. I. no. 2.) 50c. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '22.
- Johnsen, J. E. comp. China, yesterday and today. (Handbook series. Series II. vol. 3.) \$2.40. H. W. Wilson. N.Y. '28.
- King-Hall, S. I. Western civilization in the Far East. Scribner. N.Y. '24.
- Kwo, P. W. Chinese system of public education. Teachers College, Columbia Univ. N.Y. '14.
- Latourette, K. S. China under the republic. Inst. of International Education. N.Y. '21.
- Latourette, K. S. Development of China. Houghton Mifflin. Bost. '23.
- Legge, James, tr. Texts of Confucianism. Oxford. N.Y.
- Leong, Y. K. and Tao, L. K. Village and town life in China. Allen and Unwin. Lond. '24.

- Lieu, D. J. Industrial transformation of China. Commercial Press. Shanghai. '24.
- MacMurray, J. V. A. Treaties. Carnegie Endowment. Wash. D.C. '21.
- Mallory, W. H. China; land of famine. American Geographical Soc. N.Y. '26.
- Millard, T. W. Conflict of policies in Asia. Century. N.Y. '24.
- Millard, T. W. Our Eastern question. Century. N.Y. '16.
- Mims, Edwin. Adventurous America. Scribner. N.Y. '29.
- Monroe, Paul. China: a nation in evolution. Chautauqua Press. N.Y. '27.
- Monroe, Paul. Report of education in China. Inst. of International Education. N.Y. '22.
- Morse, H. B. International relations of the Chinese empire. 3 vols. Longmans, Green. N.Y. '18.
- Norton H. K. China and the powers. John Day. N.Y. '27.
- Norton, H. K. Far eastern republic of Siberia. Holt. N.Y. '23.
- Overlach, T. W. Foreign financial control of China. Macmillan. N.Y. '19.
- Page, Kirby, ed. Recent gains in American civilization. Harcourt, Brace. N.Y. '28.
- Parlovsky, L. Russia in the Far East. Macmillan. N.Y. '22.
- Ploffer, C. H. Chinese religion seen through the proverbs. China Press. Shanghai. '26.
- Ross, E. A. Changing Chinese. Century. N.Y. '12.
- Russell, Bertrand. Problem of China. Century. N.Y. '22.
- Segendre, A. F. Modern Chinese civilization. Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith, Inc. N.Y. '28.
- Soothill, W. E. China and the west. Oxford. N.Y. '25.
- Soothill, W. E. Three religions of China. Oxford. N.Y. '24.
- Stauffer, M. T. ed. Christian occupation of China. China Continuation Committee. Shanghai. '22.
- Steiger, G. N. China and the Occident. Yale Univ. Press. New Haven, Conn. '27.
- Stewart, J. L. Chinese culture and Christianity. Revell. N.Y. '26.
- Sun-Yat-Sen. International development of China. Putnam. N.Y. '22.

- Suzuki. D. T. History of Chinese philosophy. Probsthain. Lond. '14.
- Sze, T. Y. China and the most-favored-nation clause. Revell. N.Y. '26.
- Tai, E. S. Treaty ports of China. Columbia Univ. Press. N.Y. '28.
- Tyau, M. T. Z. China awakened. Macmillan. N.Y. '22.
- United States. Commission on Extraterritoriality in China. Report. Govt. Ptg. Off. Wash. D.C. '26.
- Vinacke, H. M. Problems of industrial progress in China. Princeton Univ. Press. '26.
- Wan, C. T. Political parties in China. Johns Hopkins Press. Balt. '17.
- Weale, Putnam. Vanished empire. Macmillan. N.Y. '26.
- Weale, Putnam. Why China sees red. Dodd, Mead. N.Y. '25.
- Wilhelm, Richard. Short history of Chinese civilization. Viking Press. N.Y. '29.
- Williams, E. T. China; yesterday and today. Crowell. N.Y. '23.
- Williams, S. Wells. Middle kingdom. Scribner. N.Y. '95.
- Willoughby, W. W. China and the conference. Johns Hopkins Press. Balt. '22.
- Willoughby, W. W. Constitutional government in China. Carnegie Endowment. Wash. D.C. '22.
- Willoughby, W. W. Foreign rights and interests in China. Johns Hopkins Press. Balt. '20.
- Wong, Ching Wai. China and the nations. Stokes. N.Y. '27.
- Woodhead, H. G. W. Truth about the Chinese republic. Hurst and Hackett. Lond. '25.
- Woodhead, H. G. W., ed. China year book. Tientsin Press. Tientsin. '26. (and other issues.)
- Woodhead, H. G. W., Norton, H. K., and Arnold, Julian. Occidental interpretations of the far eastern problem. Univ. of Chicago Press. Chic. '26.

PERIODICALS

- American Journal of Sociology. 13:729-55. My. '08. Orient and occident. W. L. Thomas.
- American Literature. 42:314-6. Mr. '07. Fundamental difference between eastern and western ideals.

- Art and Archaeology. 22:176-86. N. '26. Turfan expeditions in Chinese Turkestan. A von Le Coq.
- Asia. 19:995-7. O. '19. Dropping the white man's burden.
- Asia. '26-'27. "Chinese Head and Chinese Heart" and other articles. J. McC. Coat.
- Atlantic Monthly. 125:700-12. My. '20. Crisis of western civilization. G. Ferrero.
- Atlantic Monthly. 139:729-34. Je. '27. East to west. R. Tagore.
- Blackwood's Magazine. 219:293-316, 562-78, 699-705, 835-53; 220: 145-7. Mr., Je., Ag. '26. Modern Chinese portraits. Louis Magrath King.
- Century. 73:313-16. D. '06. Eastern and western ideals: rejoinder to Bryan. G. L. Dickinson.
- Century. 105:710-19. Mr. '23. East and west in world politics. V. Pepper.
- Century. 109:424-8. '25. Balance sheet of civilization. G. Frank.
- Charities and the Commons. 19:785-93. O. 5, '07. Effects of occidental civilization in the Orient. E. J. Easton.
- Chautauquan. 42:25-34. S. '05. East and west. G. W. Knox.
- China Review. 3:154-7. N. '22. China's four hundred millions: where and how the Chinese live. Charles Hodges.
- China Weekly Review. 29:159-60. Jl. 5, '24. Best books on China.
- Chinese Economic Monthly. vols. 1-3. '24-'26. Chinese Government Bureau of Publications. Peking.
- Contemporary Review. 79:574-88. Ap. '01. France and Great Britain: two civilizations. H. Ellis.
- Contemporary Review. 128:522-4. O. '25. West and the east. G. Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 134:586-93. N. '28. Revolt of Asia: a clash of civilizations. A. Lobanov-Rostovsky.
- Current History. 23:401. D. '25. Rising tide of anti-European-ism in the orient. F. Coppola.
- Current History. 24:570-5. Jl. '26. China's students in the vanguard of revolution. Rudlay Thomas.
- Current Literature. 29:547. N. '00. Orient and the occident. P. S. Reinsch.
- Current Literature. 44:298-301. Mr. '08. Poet's interpretation of oriental wisdom.

- Dial. 42:311-14. My. 16, '07. Western culture in eastern lands. A. Vambéry.
- Foreign Affairs. 5:446-58. Ap. '27. Young China. Paul Monroe.
- Fortnightly Review. 88:391-402. S. '07. East and west in council. M. C. Fraser.
- Forum. 51:535-41. Ap. '14. Paramount problem of the east. J. I. Bryan.
- Forum. 73:698-704. My. '25. What is civilization? Answer of China. Chi-Fung Liu.
- Forum. 74:356-9. S. '25. Can East meet West? Y. Markino.
- Geographical Review. 12:19-41. Ja. '22. Geographical factor in the development of Chinese civilization. Carl Whiting Bishop.
- Geographical Review. 15:1-24. Ja. '25. Distribution of population in China: economic and political significance. Percy M. Roxby.
- Gunton. 20:127-35. F. '01. Chinese civilization. A. B. Hulbert.
- Harper's Magazine. 106:190-2. Ja. '03. Chinese and western civilization. Wu Ting-Fang.
- Harper's Magazine. 122:475-8. F. '11. Ancient culture and modern consciousness.
- Harper's Magazine. 144:78-89. D. '21. Wise men from the east and wise men from the west. A. M. Richbany.
- Harper's Magazine. 155:460-8. S. '27. Far east's reaction to western civilization. A. J. Toynbee.
- Harper's Magazine. 157:265-73. Ag. '28. Is western civilization in peril? C. A. Beard.
- Literary Digest. 53:969. O. 14, '16. East and West.
- Literary Digest. 92:20-96. Mr. 12, '27. Special China section.
- Living Age. 233:513-25. My. 31, '02. Principles of western civilization.
- Living Age. 270:500-2. Ag. 19, '11. East and West.
- Living Age. 285:259-65. My. 1, '15. Will western civilization survive? P. M. Bose.
- Living Age. 286:332-42. Ag. 7, '15. East and West: a new line of cleavage. J. D. Whelpley.
- Living Age. 297:477-80. My. 25, '18. Meeting of the East and the West. R. Tagore.

- Living Age. 306:254-60. Jl. 31, '20. Death of western civilization. E. Franz.
- Living Age. 309:307-402. My. 14, '21. Asia as a teacher. E. Everth.
- Living Age. 311:523-9. N. 26, '21. East and West. R. Tagore.
- Living Age. 312:139-150. Ja. 2, '22. Union of cultures. R. Tagore.
- Living Age. 316:7-11. Ja. 6, '23. Peace of Cathay. Ku Hung-Ming.
- Living Age. 328:454-9. F. 27, '26. East and West: the essential difference. M. Standing.
- Living Age. 330:358-61. Ag. 14, '26. Europe and the East. J. R. Block.
- Mentor. 17:7. Ja. '30. East is West. W. Durant.
- Nation. 99:432. O. 8, '14. Downfall of western civilization. Y. Noguchi.
- Nation. 101:145-6. Jl. 29, '15. Japanese scholar on western civilization. Y. Noguchi.
- National Conference of Social Work. Proceedings. 1928:62-71. Impact of industry upon the Orient and its implications for the West. A. J. Todd.
- National Geographic Magazine. 23:931-58. O. '12. Wonderful canals of China. F. H. King.
- National Geographic Magazine. 36:57-77. Jl. '19. Hunter of plants: work of Frank N. Meyer in China. David Fairchild.
- National Geographic Magazine. 38:335-428. N. '20. China—various articles.
- National Geographic Magazine. 43:113-43. F. '23. Thousand miles along the great wall of China. Adam Warwick.
- Natural History. 26:570-9. N. '26. Prehistoric man of central China. N. C. Nelson.
- Nineteenth Century. 70:350-66. Ag. '11. East, West and human progress.
- Nineteenth Century. 70:860-70. N. '11. East and West; a study of differences.
- North American Review. 224:669-74. D. '27. East is east and West is west. K. Hamada.
- North American Review. 225:310-17. Mr. '28. Occidental snobs in oriental politics. G. E. Anderson.

- Outlook. 140:363-6. Jl. 8, '25. How to read the news from China. Raymond T. Rich.
- Overland Monthly. 51:215. Mr. '08. Oriental and occidental civilization. J. A. Henshall.
- Putnam's Magazine. 4:410-14. Jl. '08. America in the Orient. D. A. Willey.
- Review of Reviews. 29:105-6. Ja. '04. Western civilization as a Buddhist views it.
- Review of Reviews. 36:488-9. O. '07. Is civilization really travelling westward?
- Review of Reviews. 53:618. My. '16. Social idealism. East and West.
- Review of Reviews. 72:71-2. Jl. '25. What keeps China together? Harold Balme.
- Review of Reviews. 72:173-82. Jl. '25. Education of China. Charles Keyser Edmunds.
- Royal Asiatic Society. North China Branch. Journal. Extra vol. 3:1-194. '24. Social organization of the Manchus. S. M. Shiroko-Goroff.
- School and Society. 5:430-4. Ap. 14, '17. Oriental culture in modern pedagogics. B. K. Sarkar.
- Science' Progress. 19:275-95. O. '24. Art and medicine in China. E. V. Cowdry.
- Scientific Monthly. 24:5-14, 169-81, 224-35, 337-47. Ja. Ap. '27. Mongolia, the new world. William K. Gregory.
- Scribner's Magazine. 37:251-2. F. '05. Oriental estimate of our civilization.
- Scribner's Magazine. 43:1-20, 197-214, 307-27, 434-49. Ja.-Ap. '08. West in the Orient. C. M. Pepper.
- Scribner's Magazine. 49:29-40. Ja. '11. West in the East from an American point of view. P. Collier.
- Smithsonian Institution. Report. 1902:509-29. Oriental elements of culture in the Occident. G. Jacob.
- Smithsonian Institution. Report. 1911:539-67. Chinese architecture and its relation to Chinese culture. E. Boerschmann.
- World's Work. 51:273-88. Ja. '26. Our new discoveries in the Gobi Desert. Roy Chapman Andrews.
- World's Work. 51:376-95. F. '26. On the trail of ancient man. Roy Chapman Andrews.

INDEX

- Acland, Richard T. D. (Oxford),
 24, 39
 Allen, J. R. (Ohio State), 249, 265
 Anderson, W. E., 183
 Arbitration of international disputes,
 Ch. III, 131; brief, 132; Colum-
 bia University affirmative and
 Victoria College of New Zealand
 University negative speeches, 141;
 bibliography, 170
 Arnold, W. Joseph (Northwestern),
 69, 70, 100
 Back, J. Gunnar (Wisconsin), 252,
 270
 Barney, Lew K., 183
 Bates College; debate on Censor-
 ship, Ch. VI, 287
 Beman, Lamar T., 425
 Bernstein, Maurice (New York),
 343, 356
 Boutzer, Gregson (Southern Califor-
 nia), 198, 209
 Burke, John (Columbia), 158
 Calendar. *See* Cotsworth thirteen
 month calendar
 Capel, Robert, 327, 363
 Carmody, Edward (Iowa), 94, 106
 Censorship; Ch. VI, 287; brief, 288;
 Bates College affirmative and neg-
 ative speeches, 295; bibliography,
 318
 Chain store system, Ch. II, 61;
 brief, 62; Northwestern Univer-
 sity affirmative and University
 of Iowa negative speeches, 69;
 bibliography, 116
 Chambers, Thomas, 362
 Chinese Debating Council of Har-
 vard University; debate on Ori-
 ental versus western civilization
 with Western Reserve University,
 Ch. IX, 417
 Colbert, Ralph A., 417, 425, 432,
 436, 440, 446, 447, 449, 451, 452,
 453, 458
 Colorado State Teachers College;
 debate on International disarm-
 amment, with the University of
 Southern California, Ch. IV, 183
 Columbia University; debate on Ar-
 bitration of international disputes,
 with Victoria College of New
 Zealand University, Ch. III, 131
 Cotsworth thirteen month calendar,
 Ch. VIII, 379; brief, 380; Uni-
 versity of Pittsburgh affirmative
 and negative speeches, 383; bib-
 liography, 408
 Cox, Donald C. (Missouri), 21, 36
 Crowder, Edward T. jr. (Pitts-
 burgh), 392, 406
 Cunningham, C. C., 61
 Debts. *See* Foreign debts and the
 tariff
 Diplock, William J. K. (Oxford),
 30
 Disarmament. *See* International
 disarmament
 Dutton, Wilbur (Colorado), 194,
 204
 Education. *See* Higher education
 for exceptional students only
 Ewbank, H. L., 227
 Fels, Jerome L. (Northwestern), 89,
 108
 Finley, G. W., 183
 Folsom, Franklin, 335
 Foreign debts and the tariff; Ch. I,
 11; brief, 12; Oxford University
 affirmative and University of Mis-
 souri negative speeches, 17; bib-
 liography, 43
 Galloway, Eileen, 335, 363
 Gould, Samuel (Bates), 310
 Hall, Walter (Victoria), 155
 Harvard University. *See* Chinese
 Debating Council of Harvard
 University
 Higher education for exceptional
 students only, Ch. VII, 327;
 brief, 328; Swarthmore College
 affirmative and New York Uni-
 versity negative speeches, 335;
 discussion, 359; bibliography, 364
 Hunt, Everett L., 327, 359, 360, 361
 Inman, O. G., 183
 International disarmament; Ch. IV,
 183; brief, 184; University of
 Southern California affirmative
 and Colorado State Teachers Col-
 lege negative speeches, 191; bib-
 liography, 212
 Iowa, University of; debate on the
 Chain store system, with North-
 western University, Ch. II, 61

- Jones, Glenn (Southern California), 191, 206
- Kain, William (Swarthmore), 343, 358, 359, 361
- Kammholz, T. C. (Wisconsin), 245, 267
- Kelly, W. R., 183
- Kiang, Peter K. (Harvard), 417, 437, 446, 447, 449
- Krim, Arthur B. (Columbia), 131, 150
- Kwong, Victor K. (Harvard), 417, 426, 427, 447, 452, 453
- Lewis, Eleanor F., 61, 116
- Liquor problem. *See* Ontario system of liquor control
- Litchman, Fred (Colorado), 200, 207
- McClurkin, Robert (Pittsburgh), 388, 399
- MacKenna, Bernard J. M. (Oxford), 18
- Manning, John J. (Bates), 295, 315
- Millson, W. A. D., 417
- Missouri, University of; debate on Foreign debts and the tariff, with Oxford University, Ch. I, 11
- Monroe, Alan H., critic judge, 227, 272, 273
- Mountjoy, William J. (Victoria), 164
- Murphy, Richard (Pittsburgh), 379, 383
- New York University; debate on Higher education for exceptional students only, with Swarthmore College, Ch. VII, 327
- Newman, Sanford (New York), 349, 354, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363
- Nichols, Professor, 183
- Northwestern university; debate on the Chain store system, with the University of Iowa, Ch. II, 61
- Ohio state university; debate on Ontario system of liquor control, with the University of Wisconsin, Ch. V, 227
- Ontario system of liquor control, Ch. V, 227; brief, 228; University of Wisconsin affirmative and Ohio State University negative speeches, 237; bibliography, 276
- Oriental versus western civilization, Ch. IX, 417; brief, 418; Chinese Debating Council of Harvard University and Western Reserve University affirmative and negative arguments, 425; discussion, 446; bibliography, 460
- Owen, Ralph D. (Swarthmore), 340, 355, 360
- Oxford University; debate on Foreign debts and the tariff, with the University of Missouri, Ch. I, 11
- Pangrave, Andrew (Western Reserve), 432, 453
- Parrish, W. M., 379
- Pittsburgh, University of; debate on Cotsworth thirteen month calendar, (broadcast) Ch. VIII, 379
- Poole, William, chairman, 335, 338, 340, 343, 346, 348, 352, 353, 355, 359, 362, 363
- Powles, Guy R. (Victoria), 146
- Prettyman, Charles E. (Missouri), 27
- Prohibition. *See* Ontario system of liquor control
- Quimby, Brooks, 287
- Rabinovitz, David (Wisconsin), 237, 263
- Reeves, Albert L. (Missouri), 33, 40
- Schug, C. H. (Ohio State), 257, 268
- Schumacher, Howard (Iowa), 75, 98
- Schwarz, Lawrence T. (Columbia), 141
- Shero, Mr., 335
- Sorensen, L. J. (Ohio State), 241, 261
- Southern California, University of; debate on International disarmament, with Colorado State Teachers College, Ch. IV, 183
- Spirer, Jess (Pittsburgh), 384, 401
- Strauss, Samuel (Pittsburgh), 395, 403
- Swarthmore College; debate on Higher education for exceptional students only, with New York University, Ch. VII, 327
- Tariff. *See* Foreign debts and the tariff
- Thomas, Howard E. (Bates), 305
- Tisdell, Dean, 17, 21, 24, 30, 36, 42
- Victoria College of New Zealand University; debate on Arbitration of international disputes, with Columbia University, Ch. III, 131
- Wanamaker, John (Western Reserve), 440, 451, 452, 453
- Weatherbee, Randolph A. (Bates), 299
- Weaver, A. T., critic judge, 61, 110
- Webber, Fred (Iowa), 84, 102
- Western civilization. *See* Oriental versus western civilization
- Western Reserve University; debate on Oriental versus western civilization, with the Chinese Debating Council of Harvard University, Ch. IX, 417

- Wilensky, Hyman (New York) 338,
 352
 Williams, Aubrey, 237, 272
 Wilson, Lawrence (Swarthmore),
 336, 353, 362, 363
 Wines, William (Northwestern), 80,
 104
 Wisconsin, University of; debate on
 Ontario system of liquor control,
 with Ohio State University, Ch.
 V, 227
 Woodward, H. S., 417
 Yoakum, Chairman, 69, 75, 80, 84,
 89, 93, 98, 110
 Young, Robert F., 11

27-28

LIBRARY

Date Due

JUN 25 1934

930

DEC 21 1934

WITHDRAWN

3878

as State College
RARY





S0-DLS-940

